DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 523 AA 000 689

AUTHOR	Robinson, Lora H.
TITLE	The Status of Academic Women.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	Review - 5
PUB DATE	Apr 71
NOTE	30p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Discriminatory Attitudes (Social), *Employment Opportunities, *Employment Patterns, *Females, *Higher Education, Social Discrimination, *Women Professors, Working Women

ABSTRACT

This report on the status of academic women is divided into 3 parts. Section 1 presents a review of 4 major research studies that collectively provide a comprehensive description of academic women. The studies are: "Academic Women," by Jesse Barnard, "The Woman Doctorate in America," by Helen Astin, "Women and the Doctorate," by Susan Mitchell, and "Women as College Teachers," by Jean Henderson. The specific criteria most frequently used by investigators to assess the status of academic women are also discussed. Section 2 consists of 54 annotated campus reports that cover employment conditions for women at 65 institutions of higher education. The third section describes 25 projects covering the establishment of committees, task forces, and study groups by professional associations specifically to collect and disseminate information on employment conditions for women at various institutions and within specialized fields. (AF)

ED 048 523

REVIEW 5

THE STATUS OF ACADEMIC WOMEN

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

The George Washington University
1 Dupont Circle, Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20036

APRIL 1971

AA000 689

THE STATUS OF ACADEMIC WOMEN

by

Lora H. Robinson

Review 5

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
The George Washington University
One Dupont Circle, Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20036

April 1971

FOREWORD

The publication of literature and creation of committees concerned with defining the status of academic women are comparatively recent phenomena. This review surveys and summarizes recent developments in this area and describes activities whose purpose is to assess and improve the status of women in higher education. Lora Robinson, the author, is a Clearinghouse staff member and is currently writing her doctoral dissertation in higher education.

The fifth in a series of reviews on various aspects of higher education, this paper represents one of several types of Clearinghouse publications. Others include commissioned papers, bibliographies and compendia based on recent significant documents found both in and outside the ERIC collection. In addition, the current research literature of higher education is abstracted and indexed for publication in the U.S. Office of Education's monthly issue, *Research in Education.* Readers who which to order ERIC documents cited in the bibliography should write to the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Drawer 0, Bethesda, Maryland 20014. When ordering, please specify the ERIC document (ED) number. Payment for microfiche (MF) or hard/photo copies (HC) must accompany orders of less than $10.00. All orders must be in writing.

Carl J. Lange, *Director*
ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
April 1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Overview	iv
Review	1
Annotated Campus Reports	12
Directory of Projects	20
References	25

OVERVIEW

This report is concerned with identifying both the activities and the writing aimed at defining the current status of academic women. It is divided into three sections: an essay which reviews some of the important literature in the field, a series of annotated campus reports, and a directory of beginning or continuing projects focused primarily on women in higher education. Following the directory of projects is a list of references. Except for three instances, reference sources cited in the section on campus reports do not appear again in this final bibliography.

Four major research studies which together provide comprehensive description of the academic woman are reviewed in the first part of the essay. These are *Academic Women* by Jessie Bernard, *The Woman Doctorate in America* by Helen Astin, *Women and the Doctorate* by Susan Mitchell, and "Women as College Teachers" by Jean Henderson. All of these works examine in detail both the personal characteristics of woman doctorates and aspects of their professional lives. Factors such as scholarly achievement, employment rates income levels, rank, and others, that would tend to confirm or deny claims of sexual discrimination were investigated. Other notions, such as the contention that women pursue careers only because they are unable to get married were proven groundless.

The essay next discusses the specific criteria used most frequently by investigators to assess the status of academic women. These variables include: extent of participation, rank, departmental affiliation, tenure, exceptional appointment, initial appointment level, promotion, salary, and involvement in administration. Summaries of the studies using these criteria indicate, again, ample documentation of the inferior status of women on college and university faculties. A table indicating which institutions are included in computations and/or discussions of status criteria appears at the end of this section.

The second section of this document consists of annotated campus reports. The 54 entries cover 65 higher education institutions, and they are listed alphabetically to facilitate comparisons among institutions. These reports generally deal with employment conditions for women at individual campuses, and so are the source of information for much of the discussion in the essay. Many of the reports cover determinants of status other than the criteria mentioned previously. These additional factors include policies on "in-bred hiring," nepotism, maternity leaves, sabbaticals, released time, leaves of absence, institutional grant funds, and fringe benefits, and retirement systems. Of these, nepotism policies have so far received the most attention. Although most of the reports are unpublished, many are available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

The third part is a directory of 23 projects related to defining and improving the status of academic women. Almost all of the activities involve the establishment of committees, task forces and the like by professional associations to collect and disseminate information on employment conditions for women at various institutions and within specialized fields. Some of the committees not only recommend policy changes in their publications, but also try to implement them through open hearings and discussions and alliances with other interested organizations. Project items are listed alphabetically according to sponsor and include a brief description of the activity as well as the name and address of the person to contact for further information.

This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

REVIEW

Perhaps in no other area is the lower status of women in our society more dramatically apparent than in higher education–a realm allegedly devoted to fairness and objectivity. The existence of a pattern of discrimination is evident when one examines the 42 studies cited in this paper on the status of academic women. Undertaken by individuals and groups both on and off the campus, these studies naturally vary in depth and breadth, but collectively they provide a significant current assessment of the standing of academic women. The validity of their findings is confirmed by the cases won by a growing number of women within universities who are filing formal charges of sex discrimination with the federal government under provisions for compliance with federal contracts (for example, see Achbar and Bishop, 1970; Batten 1970; Bazell, 1970; Collins, 1969; Grouchow, 1970; Hawkins, 1969; Logan, Jr., 1970; Wentworth, 1970; and "Rebelling Women," 1970). This resort to legal action could potentially compel 80% of the nation's higher education institutions to revise their employment policies.

Women doctorates

Studies of the woman doctorate provide a great deal of information on the status of academic women. There are four major research works in the field: Jessie Bernard's *Academic Women,* Helen Astin's *The Woman Doctorate in America,* Susan Mitchell's *Women and the Doctorate,* and Jean Henderson's "Women as College Teachers" (two other studies on women doctorates are Winkler, 1968, and Simon, Clark and Galway, 1967).

Bernard's landmark book, published in 1964, served for some time as the major source on this topic. She skillfully wove statistical and case history data to present a picture of the woman faculty member in higher education.

> Pieced together from a wide variety of sources, the modal picture of the academic woman that emerges is of a very bright person so far as test-intelligence is concerned, but compliant rather than aggressive, from an above average social class background, and with a major interest in the humanities.

Several significant sources of information have since confirmed many of Bernard's findings as well as contributed some of their own.

Astin (1969) provides one of the most up-to-date investigations on the academic woman. Her book benefits from a large national sample–women receiving research doctorates in 1957-58–and sophisticated statistical analyses. From the background data provided by these women, today's description of the typical woman PhD would probably read: She will be an extremely rare bird since only one in ten doctorates is awarded to women. It probably took her 12 years from the B.A. to finish her degree, so she will have received her doctorate later in life and will be older than her male colleagues. Yet her measured intellectual ability is likely to be superior. Her chances of receiving the degree in any one of the four major areas–natural sciences, social sciences, arts and humanities or education–are about equal. Her parents are more likely to be of a higher socioeconomic class than her male counterpart. She is likely to be single, but if she is married, she married later in life to a man whose field was the same or related to hers, and they have no more than 2.02 children. They are likely to live in a metropolitan area, and she will be working, probably full time. She has probably been with the same employer or had only one other since receiving her degree. The odds are 4 out of 5 that she will be employed in an educational setting. She is likely to have published three or four articles. These findings provide only a cursory summary of the book's contents. To reflect the book's flavor more fully, one aspect–findings related to scholarly productivity–is discussed in greater detail.

Some of the indices of scholarly productivity Astin analyzed were books and papers published in the field of specialization and papers presented at professional meetings. Because of space limitations, only article publication will be covered here. The principal factor found to be associated with number of published articles was field of specialization–natural scientists being most productive and humanists the least. The quality of the doctorate's degree-granting institution was the next best predictor of productivity. Hindrances to production included marital status and number of children.

After the effect of the personal and environmental variables were controlled statistically, some additional factors proved to have a significant relationship to article production: (1) employment in a research position; (2) time spent in research activities; (3) level of professional activity; (4) number of times honored for achievements; (5) income level; and (6) reported discrimination. With regard to the last variable, Astin states:

> The highly productive woman doctorate reported having experienced employer discrimination on account of her sex. . . .Nor can their reports be regarded as evidence of a "sour grapes" attitude, since they have proved themselves successful in their fields. On the contrary, it would seem that their reports indicate that employer bias against women does exist and should be taken seriously.

Bernard postulated that academic competition discriminates against the best women candidates as the result of a sociological process (Simon and Rosenthal, 1967, or Simon, Clark and Tifft, 1966, also seem indicative of this process).

> Only the best become competitors. . . .When there are many disabilities among the competitors, prejudiced discrimination is not needed. Less qualified contestants can be rejected on many functional grounds. . . .it is only when all other grounds for rejection are missing that prejudiced discrimination per se is brought into play.

She argued that although there may be individual cases of prejudiced discrimination and prejudice against the female academic elite, the existence of it on a mass scale was an untenable proposition. Indeed, in her book, the many differences noted in status between academic men and women on a widespread scale are not left without a plausible reason or interpretation to account for them. In Astin's investigation, however, employer discrimination was second only to inadequate household help as the greatest obstacles to career development cited by women doctorates.

Astin believes that her findings have a number of important policy implications. She recommends that: (1) educational and guidance efforts be directed toward encouraging young women to pursue advanced training in specialized fields; (2) special scholarships be established in fields that women are not now inclined to choose; (3) women be allowed to take their training on a part-time basis; (4) methods to lighten her "environmental" burdens be implemented; (5) women be allowed to work part-time with all the status and benefits accorded full-time employees; and (6) discriminatory actions such as differential salary scales and academic regulations concerning nepotism and pregnancies be removed.

Mitchell (1968) wished to elicit information about women doctorates to justify their personal efforts and societal investment in women's education, and to uncover impediments to their educational and professional progress. Her subjects included all women doctorates from Oklahoma's PhD-granting institutions. Eighty-five percent returned a four-page questionnaire that covered personal characteristics, motivational factors, enabling or impeding factors, and the use and value of the doctorate. The personal characteristics of this sample were different in some ways from the average picture presented by national studies. For example, the women's parental education was lower than the average–just less than high school graduation. Such differences point to the value of local studies. Often it may not be wise to tackle local problems on the basis of national trends.

Other notable findings included the fact that over 20% did not major in a first-choice field, either because the field or the preferred degree was not offered. The median time lapse from BA to PhD was about 17 years, and for pursuing the PhD, 5 years. Personal ambition and desire for improved competency were the main reasons given for pursuing the doctorate.

Several factors differentiated those who were delayed–i.e., exceeded the 5-year median in pursuing the doctorate–from those who were not. Impeding factors included family responsibilities, income loss, cost of acquiring the doctorate, proximity of the institution (the closer the institution, the longer it took), and the time lapsed before starting the degree. Only 40% of the women reported that the institution from which they received their doctorate was a first choice.

Statistics show that the doctorates earned were being used and of value to the recipients. Employment rates were 99%, 98% being full-time. Eighty percent were employed in higher education with those in colleges holding higher positions and receiving better salaries than those in universities. University women, however, expressed significantly more satisfaction than other women with their employment. All respondents expressed satisfaction with having earned the doctorate. Fifty percent stated that they had experienced discrimination at one time.

Mitchell concludes that the state and nation's investment in the preparation of women doctorates is well repaid as are the women who expend the effort. To facilitate the process of attaining the degree, she recommends: providing more financial assistance, publicizing the value of the degree through various media, and fostering equitable treatment of women as graduate students.

Henderson (1967) combines a research interest in women with exploration of their status as a function of discrimination. The strength of this study is that comparable male and female peers are sampled. The subjects were college teachers who had been Woodrow Wilson Fellows in 1958 and 1959. The purpose of the study was to determine if women had the same opportunities as men and, if not, whether differences were due to women's preferences or discrimination. Since the results of studies on college teachers are often muddied by the fact that more men than women have PhDs, PhD and non-PhD holders were analyzed separately. Unless otherwise specified, all the following comments refer to PhD holders.

One major area of consideration was the initial job-seeking process. Men and women did not differ in their rankings of institutions in terms of employment preferences, nor were women actually employed in smaller or less prestigious institutions. However, men had three times the initial job offers, and were able to secure positions in institutions they preferred to a greater proportion than women. More men than women applied for preferred positions. Women did not apply because of nepotism rules, immobility, or simply because they felt that women simply weren't hired there and that they wouldn't get the job anyway.

Although equal to men in qualifications, first appointments for women were at a lower rank and lower salary for the same rank. Academic rank differences were more prevalent at colleges than universities, whereas salary differences were the reverse. Comparisons made across fields of specialization revealed no differences in appointments as a function of subject specialty. Women were teaching the same class levels of courses as men, and there were no sex differences in the levels preferred. More women than men expressed disappointment in their job saying that it was less than they had anticipated when in graduate school. The author concludes that none of the following factors can explain the differences in initial appointment, rank, and pay: qualifications, institutional preferences, subject specialization, teaching level, and type of institution.

Differences in other aspects of the job were explored. Women preferred to serve on the same committees as men but, in fact, served less and on less prestigious committees. Women and men reported the same administrative tasks. The number of publications varied as a function of institutional affiliation rather than sex. Although women attended few professional meetings, they were equal in presentations made.

When asked about the amount of time spent in various activities and the amount of time preferred, females reported spending more time teaching but preferring less. Both sexes spent equal amounts of time on research and preferred more. Men did more student counseling, but women preferred to spend more time in such activities.

Attitudinal responses were solicited in a number of areas. About 85% of both sexes felt that it was easier for a male to become a college teacher, and both sexes would warn females preparing for a college teaching career of the difficulties involved. Seventy-five percent of the men and 60% of the women felt that a male departmental chairman was favored. Sixty percent of the males and 46% of the females thought that men had more prestige on campus. None thought that women had more prestige. Sixty-four percent of the PhD and 50% of the non-PhD women reported encountering discrimination from one or more of the following groups: students, colleagues, chairmen, administrators, or the public.

A few items indicated the female's career orientations. The women vetoed the idea that they embarked on their careers because nothing more attractive (marriage) offered itself. They listed intrinsic interest as the reason for career aspirations. Single women stated that they would not abandon their career for marriage, and married women said that they would not turn down a promotion which would result in a position above their husband's.

The author concludes that sex-based discrimination is evident in the case of the women doctorates. It is not as clear in the case of the non-PhD's, although the pattern is somewhat similar.

Together, the findings of Bernard, Astin, Mitchell and Henderson confirm many of the claims of sex-based discrimination, but negate some prejudicial notions about academic women. The next section will examine the specific criteria used by various investigators to assess the status of faculty women.

Extent of participation

College and university reports* aimed at determining the status of women, mostly on their own campuses, began to appear in 1969. Thus, the data for each school are recent. Although the reports are quite varied, the first concern of most is the participation rate of women on the institution's faculty (see Siegel and Carr, 1969, for a discussion of the definitional problems encountered when making a faculty count). Often a simple count of the total number of women faculty members is made. Nationally, women are about 20% of the college teachers ("Highest percentage...," 1970). For the 40 institutions** where percentages could be determined, the range of participation for women in the total faculty was from 2 to 35%. Thirty-six of the 40 schools reported a participation rate of 25% or less. Half of the schools employed less than 16% women.

Rank

Along with, or instead of, the total faculty count, reports contain a breakdown of the participation data into some other logical grouping such as departments, areas, schools or divisions, colleges within a university system or rank. Some of these, such as departmental and rank breakdowns, directly reflect the standing of women

*When an institution is mentioned in the text, the reference source is cited under the institution's name in the following section, *Annotated Campus Reports*. See also, Table 2 for the institutions which are included in any computations and/or discussions of status criteria. Table 2 appears at the end of the review essay.

**All 40 institutions are coeducational. There is a tremendous difference in staffing patterns between coeducational and non-coed schools. Women's colleges have, by far, the greatest numbers of women faculty members. (Five women's colleges ranged from 23 to 58% women faculty members; all are above the national average.) In schools exclusively for men, there are fewer women faculty members than in coeducational institutions. (Three men's schools ranged from 1 to 8% women faculty members.) See Wilcox, 1970, Shuck, 1969, and Harris, 1970.

at a given institution. Probably the most frequent category used has been rank.*

Overall, Bernard (1964) notes that:

> the academic rank of women is inferior to that of men in all kinds of institutions. . . .This is true even of women with the same qualifications as men, whether measured by the doctorate. . .or by productivity. . . .The differential varies according to type of institutions. It also varies according to subject matter, women constituting a larger proportion of the upper ranks in some areas, such as home economics and library science, than in others, such as the sciences. . . .

Simon and Rosenthal (1967) (or see Simon, Clark and Galway, 1967) found that women PhDs in the physical and natural sciences, social sciences, humanities and education were at a lower rank than their male PhD colleagues. Schuck (1969) reports that in political science "most women, in all institutions, are concentrated in the lower ranks." Wilcox (1970), studying English faculties, states

> it is clear that the proportion of women who have risen to the upper ranks. . .is considerably smaller than the proportion of men and that the great majority of women (over 70%) are to be found at the lower levels of the hierarchy.

In sociology, Rossi (1970b) found that 42% of the men with a doctoral degree are full professors while only 16% of the women PhDs hold this position. Further, after 20 years, 90% of the men PhDs, 53% of the single women PhDs and 41% of the married women PhDs had reached a full professorship.

At Stanford, one-half of the men are professors or associate professors, but fewer than one-tenth of the women are at these ranks. Sixty-seven percent of all women are research associates, instructors and lecturers, whereas only 28% of the men are at these ranks. This trend is repeated elsewhere. At the University of Oregon, 32% of the men and 5% of the women are professors, and 76% of the women and 45% of the men are in the lowest two ranks of assistant professor and instructor. Thirty-five percent of the men and 10% of the women are full professors at the University of Washington. Thirty-six percent of the women and 8% of the men are in the instructor and lecturer ranks.

Nationally the makeup of college and university faculties by rank is 21.6% professors, 20.7% associate professors, 28.3% assistant professors and 19.9% instructors (Bayer, 1970). If one assumes that this distribution is a reasonable facsimile of the way the ranks should be divided among a given faculty, the percentages of women who hold positions at every level except assistant professor are quite discrepant. Bayer's data show that women run below the national levels for the top two ranks, about equal with the third, and well ahead on the bottom rank.

How women stand with respect to rank has been handled in a number of ways in institutional reports. Some reports are very detailed, showing the numbers of women in every faculty title possible within their institution. A sampling of the kinds of positions which have been used includes: laboratory associate or assistant, preceptor, adjunct, tutor, post-doctoral assistant, assistant instructor, fellow, associate, emeriti, and various labels usually applied to those still in graduate training. The most common ranks covered are those of the regular faculty–instructor, assistant, associate and full professor.

These four regular faculty ranks were used in compiling the following percentages from institutional reports (coeducational institutions only). Twenty-nine reports had enough information to be included in the comparisons. Women infrequently comprise more than 10% of the full professors (3 of 29 schools) and are never more than 20% at all institutions. Women never comprise more than 30% of the associate professor rank, and at 26 of the schools they are 20% or less. Women are never more than 30% of the assistant professors, and at 11 institutions they constitute 10% or less. Women sometimes comprise as much as 50% of the instructor rank, yet at four schools they are 10% or less. There seems to be a relatively fixed ceiling on women's participation in the upper three ranks. Only the rank of instructor shows significant variability in the participation rate of women across institutions. Further, these figures concur with those that show women comprise more of the lower than the upper levels of the hierarchy; i.e., women constitute a smaller proportion of each ascending rank.

A couple of reports have attempted to estimate the participation rate of women by rank under conditions of maximum utilization. The University of Arizona report provides a good example of this approach (see also, Columbia University for a similar approach). The three variables accounted for when calculating the hypothetical participation rates are the percentage of PhD's granted to women in the 40s, 50s, and 60s, the percentage of working women doctorates, and modal hiring and promotion rates. Then the actual ratio of women doctorates to all faculty with doctorates is compared to the estimate, rank by rank. Using this procedure, women were underemployed at all levels.

Although several significant factors were accounted for in the analysis above, other relevant variables which would affect the estimate could be suggested. Nevertheless, the above case exemplifies the current status of analysis in this area, and the information supplied from these derivations are at least a start toward providing the facts on the status of women in higher education.

---

*Note that two types of comparisons are made: (1) the percentage of each rank or position that are women; and (2) the percentage of each sex that hold the ranks or positions under consideration. The first generally provides a better picture of women's positions with respect to rank.

Departments

Departmental breakdowns run a close second to rank as a category used in reports, but the presentations here vary a great deal. Some schools present the faculty figures for every department. More often, selected departments are used. Usually, departments that traditionally have been considered women's departments, such as nursing and home economics, are omitted. Also omitted are departments in which women are very rarely employed, such as engineering. Thus, both extremes in women's participation rates have been left out.

Although departmental figures appear alone in many cases, comparison figures of various types sometimes accompany them. The most common comparison figures involve the percentage of women PhDs granted in the fields corresponding to the department. Pools of women graduates are determined from yearly Office of Education reports on the number of earned degrees awarded nationally, the number of degrees earned by women at the top 10 institutions, and the number of degrees awarded by fields at the reporting institution.

Other figures included for comparison purposes have been the number of female graduate students in the department, the number of female Woodrow Wilson Dissertation Fellows by field, the number of BA majors and the number of undergraduate majors by field. Although none of these comparison groups can indicate the true number of potential faculty candidates, the underutilization of women, regardless of comparison group, usualiy is so great and occurs with such regularity that marked sexual bias in departmental staffing is indicated.

Fisher and Golde (1968) exemplify the modal approach. They report that women have received between 15 and 21% of the doctorates granted in anthropology. Yet,

> the proportion of full-time women faculty members of graduate departments of anthropology does not equal the proportion of women PhD's. . . .To expect 20 percent of all departments to be women might be unrealistic, but even the ratio of 10 men to 1 woman is not met in many universities. . . .Undoubtedly many factors can be cited to account for this distribution, aside from the presumption that discriminatory policies are operating. But even considering personal choice and the constraints imposed on a women by marriage, we feel that the distribution of women in graduate departments does suggest that women are disadvantaged.

From over 60 different departments cited in various reports, 12 were selected that appeared most frequently and caused the least confusion by possible overlapping. On the basis of these departments, a table was constructed indicating: the range of percentages at which women constitute the faculty in the given departments, the percent of PhD degrees awarded to women by fields in 1967-68 nationally (computed from Hooper and Chandler, 1969), and the number of schools which reported percentages of faculty above and below the national percentage of degrees earned. The figures suggest that, more often than not, women are employed at a rate less than they currently earn doctorate degrees.

Table 1. The participation rate of women faculty in selected departments

Departments	Range of Women Employed (in percent)	Degrees Earned by Women Nationwide (in percent)	Number of Schools below Nationwide Total of Earned Degrees	Number of Schools above Nationwide Total of Earned Degrees
Biology	0 to 45	29.0	8	1
Chemistry	0 to 14	8.0	13	2
Economics	0 to 11	5.8	7	4
Education	2 to 42	20.3	6	4
English	5 to 50	27.4	9	8
History	0 to 29	13.0	12	3
Mathematics	0 to 27	6.0	8	7
Music	0 to 29	14.5	6	7
Philosophy	0 to 15	9.1	11	1
Physics	0 to 5	8.8	9	0
Psychology	0 to 30	22.5	18	1
Sociology	0 to 19	18.5	12	1
Speech	6 to 26	18.5	7	6

Tenure

Sometimes tenure is considered concomitantly with enumerations of women by rank and department. Although tenure is usually granted at the associate and full professor rank, with other rank designations containing non-tenured persons, there are exceptions. How these exceptions may operate as a function of sex has not been studied systematically. Some have suggested that the practice of offering exceptional positions to women becomes a barrier to earning tenure.

If one could assume that the modal case is that tenure comes with the rank of associate professor, the figures on rank above would indicate that women usually constitute less than 25% of the tenured faculty. In fact, at only six of the institutions covered would women make up more than 25% of the tenured faculty. But statistics from Bayer's study (1970) indicate it is misleading to take the upper two ranks as indicative of tenure. While 25.1% of the women are in the ranks of professor and associate professor, 37.5% report having a regular appointment with tenure. Comparable figures for men are 46.4% and 48.8%.

Although tenure is a significant variable in determining the status of faculty women, it is difficult to get a clear picture from most of the reports gathered. Rejecting the notion that tenure is automatically conferred with a given rank leaves two means for determining tenure: (1) the direct mention of the rank at which tenure is achieved at a given institution or (2) separate tenure figures presented by sex. In the 12 cases in which the percentage of women and men who held tenure could be computed, there was no instance in which women holding tenure had equal or greater percentages than men. Differences between the percentages for tenured males and tenured females ranged from a low of 8 to a high of 40 percentage points.

Tenure and rank, along with part-time appointments, are elements often used in discussions of the "fringe" status of women faculty members. Together or independently, they are used to support claims that women are in positions which do not provide for their inclusion in the regular workings of the academic community. The claim is not an uncommon one (for a general discussion, see Bernard, 1964; Simon and Rosenthal, 1967; Rossi, 1970a; the University of Chicago, and the University of Oregon).

Exceptional appointments

Bynum and Martin (1970) point out that at Harvard women constitute a higher percentage of the irregular categories than of the regular faculty appointments. These exceptional appointments are outside the "real" system. Seigel and Carr (1969) summarize the situation at Stanford: "women comprise a small minority of the Stanford Faculty. Most hold appointments at the lower ranks, at which tenure is not often available." In 180 sociology departments, Rossi (1970b) found that:

> Women constitute a very small proportion of both joint and full-time faculty appointments (9 and 12 per cent respectively), but appear as slightly more than 1 in 4 of the part-time faculty and research associate appointments. . . .Seventy per cent of the men compared to only 55 per cent of the women held full-time faculty appointments. The proportion of women on part-time appointments was double that of men. . . .

Statistics from the institutional reports lend support to these findings. At Sacramento State College, in 12 out of 17 departments women constituted a greater percentage of the part-time than full-time faculty. The most extreme case was a department in which women were 5% of the full-time but 50% of the part-time faculty. At another school, Eastern Illinois University, women comprise 78% of the part-time faculty. The authors of the Columbia University report point out that women constitute the majority of only one category—part-time employment. The University of Oregon study reports that:

> an analysis of the number of women who have been at their present rank for six or more years confirms the presence of the Permanent Peripherals. Some 19 faculty members were in this category. Three of these were full professors, leaving 16 or 23.53 percent who could be considered to be at a dead end. We could not get comparative data for males, but we doubt strongly that almost one-fourth of the faculty men were thus locked in non-promotional positions. Only four of these 16 were instructors or senior instructors, while 10 where assistant professors. . . .

Two studies tried to account for the fact that women occupy a higher percentage of fringe than regular teaching positions. At Chicago, the committee concluded that fringe positions were desired by both the women who held them and departmental chairmen. Such positions provided needed flexibility in employment. At Stanford, both age and marital status were considered as possible explanations for the cluster of women in the junior ranks. The data did not support either factor as an explanation of the phenomenon. Two other explanations—preference for teaching activities and field of concentration—were postulated, but were not explored. At this point, it is not clear how the numerous relevant factors combine to produce the effect. The result is clear, but not the determining process.

Appointment level

Other factors contributing to faculty women's status are their initial level of appointment and their subsequent rate of promotion. There is very little information about sex differences in initial appointment level. Henderson (1967) found that first appointments for women PhDs were at a lower rank and at a lower salary than for the same rank of PhD men (see also, Freeman, 1969, and

Simon and Rosenthal, 1967). Few of the institutional reports gathered dealt with initial appointment level by sex. Eastern Illinois University reports that 67% of the new men were hired at professorial ranks in contrast to 32% of the women. At the University of Washington, women were hired, on the average, one rank lower than were men. Eighty-four percent of the men and 34% of the women were hired into the professorial ranks. Sixty-five percent of the women and 17% of the men were hired for the ranks of instructor and lecturer. The University of South Florida hired no woman doctorates for 1970-71, and women constituted a lesser percentage of the "new hirees" than the current faculty. Data for the University of Pittsburgh indicated that for Fall 1969 the median entry level for men was assistant professor and for women one grade lower. Sixty-eight percent of the men and 28% of the women were hired at the professorship levels.

Although there are few data about the actual difference in appointment levels, two studies provide information on what kind of treatment might be expected by women seeking employment. Simpson (1968) set out to determine whether employing officials in higher education were truly interested in appointing qualified women. A questionnaire was designed to reveal discriminatory employment choices and generally derogatory attitudes about women. Deans, department chairmen and total faculty in selected academic fields at six Pennsylvania institutions were sampled. Pairs of resumes were submitted to the administrators with descriptive material held constant; only the names and photos were alternated on the two forms.

Simpson found that employing agents did exhibit discriminatory attitudes toward academic women in their significantly more frequent choice and higher preference ratings of males over equally qualified females. However, the superior female was selected over the male candidate. These choices held across all levels of respondents. The more women in a given field, the more likely equally qualified female candidates would be chosen over the male. Superior females experienced significant discrimination in fields traditionally low in female employment. Age, sex, and years of experience of the judges had a significant effect on the employment selection of female candidates. Employing agents who evidenced discriminatory employment attitudes toward academic women also held negative attitudes toward women in general.

A similar study was conducted by Fidell (1970). Eight paragraphs describing the professional behavior of young psychologists were sent to chairman of every American, degree-granting psychology department. Two forms were used in order to vary the names and reference pronouns by sex. Fidell found that women were offered lower levels of appointments than men for seven of the eight candidates, and were rated less desirable in six of eight instances.

Promotion

The chronicling of promotions has been handled in a number of ways. Freeman (1969) studied the careers of women in the social sciences at the University of Chicago since 1892. Similarity of career patterns lead to the following general conclusions: (1) few women are hired; (2) few women stay beyond one appointment; (3) the first appointment is usually instructor or lecturer; (4) those who stay generally remain in untenured positions for an abnormally long time; and (5) those who become full professors do so by rising through "women's departments" or are brought in from other universities at a tenured position. In other words, not a single woman manifested a normal university career.

A similar approach was taken in a report of Pace College. In it, a table was prepared for four departments in which the rank of each faculty member was shown from 1952 to 1970. Although each person's rate of promotion is evident, it is difficult to make any direct generalization from this data. More useful are summary statistics. For example, at Eastern Illinois University women were 8.8% of the total faculty promoted. However, of the full-time faculty, 5% of the men were promoted and .5% of the women. In this case breakdowns by rank and sex were also given.

In a more detailed study, Connecticut College found that at each rank women were more likely to have their PhD when appointed. Yet, women at each rank had spent more time at that rank than men. Further, women held the degree longer before attaining each rank. Thus, on the average, women wait 4 1/2 years longer between the PhD degree and the rank of full professor.

A similar trend was found at the University of Washington. PhD and non-PhD women hired below the rank of assistant professor waited twice as long as men for their promotion to assistant professor. Also, the average time at the assistant professor rank since appointment or promotion was twice as long for women based either on the date of appointment for those with the PhD or the years since the degree was completed for those hired without the PhD.

The report providing the most depth in this area was completed at the University of California, Berkeley. It considers promotions from a number of angles. First, a budget study showed women about one step below the male average on the basis of age, and about half a step below on the basis of the date of PhD. Second, a general catalog study of two time periods compared each woman's promotion and attrition rate with the average of her male counterpart. It was found that promotion opportunities for women are more limited than for men; the proportion promoted is lower at all ranks studied and in both time periods, and those women who are promoted wait longer for the promotion. Finally, a more detailed study was made of regular faculty in the College of Letters and Sciences. Year of birth, year of doctorate,

and department were taken into account. The observed rate of advancement was lower for women based on promotion to tenure, average number of steps advanced per year, and the highest step achieved.

Criteria for promotion

Another factor which must be considered when making comparisons of males and females is the criteria for promotions. Currently, research and publication activities are more heavily stressed than teaching activities, although both probably do enter into the equation. Given the priority of publication over teaching, some of the differences in promotions might be explained by the fact that, as a whole, women's interests lean more heavily toward teaching than men's (Bayer, 1970) and perhaps result in less reward. This variable has not been adequately considered to date when studying promotions.

There is some evidence, however, that once publication rates and other significant criteria are taken into account, women will have lower status. Simon and Rosenthal (1967) (or Simon, Clark and Tifft, 1966) found that the 15% of married women with PhDs who reported they had been unable to find the type of job at the level of institution, at an appropriate salary and for which they appear to be professionally competent, outproduced all other categories (married and unmarried male and female PhDs). Fidell (1970), studying women in psychology, cited preliminary findings indicating that differences in publication rates that favor males may be exclusively at the full professor level. At lower levels, women published more than their male counterparts. Henderson (1967) found that although women were similar to men in their teaching assignments, published works, and the satisfactions they derived from their work, they were advanced in position more slowly.

At the University of Illinois a preliminary study showed that the rate of advancement was generally slower for women through the steps of instructor to assistant professor, assistant professor to associate professor and associate professor to professor. When the average rate of advancement was computed separately for males and females in six departments, women advanced more slowly in 15 out of 18 comparisons. As a result of these findings, a more detailed study was made to include significant criteria for promotion. Indices used were seven types of publications, years of experience, and honors received. An interaction effect between type of publication and sex was found. The promotion rate for a given sex depended on one's pattern of publications, but most of the advantages of the interaction benefited males. In summary, after partialling out the effects of merit and experience, sex-based inequities in rank remained. This study takes a big step toward unraveling the relationship between sex and promotion rate.

Salary

Although the question of sex differences in the rate of promotion is still not resolved entirely satisfactorily, study after study has shown that women are paid less. Although salary data have the aura of "private" information, several national studies and individual institutions have surveyed pay schedules for men and women faculty members. The National Education Association published salary figures by sex until 1965-66. Salary differences in favor of men have persisted with respect to total figures and figures by rank. Data on total income may be found in Bayer (1970). Again, men make more.

Sampling science doctorates, Bayer and Astin (1968) controlled for level of education, length of time in the work force, work activity (type of work), major field area, and type of employer. They found:

> Across all work settings, fields, and ranks, women experience a significantly lower average academic income than do men in the academic teaching labor force for the same amount of time. Within each work setting, field, and rank category, women also have lower salaries.

Henderson (1967) found that women PhDs, with equivalent experience, teaching the same levels of courses and in similar fields, received lower salaries than men. Simon and Rosenthal's (1967) (or Simon, Clark and Galway, 1967) results concur. Sampling women doctorates (1958-1963) in the physical and natural sciences, social sciences, humanities and education, they found that

> generally the woman PhD does the same type of work (teaching, research, a combination of both) at similar institutions. But she does it at a slightly lower rank and for an average of about seven hundred dollars per year less than her male colleagues.

Reports from individual institutions support institution-wide studies. The report on Columbia University contains a section on the role of Barnard College as an equalizer in the Columbia community. The authors point to the lack of endowment at women's colleges and the concomitant lower salaries of their faculty. Differences in average compensation paid to faculty favor Columbia's faculty. For the professorial ranks they are $5,648 for full professor, $2,721 for associate professor and $1,765 for assistant professor. The report viewed the differences as "punishment" for women in the teaching profession.

Salary differences found when comparing a predominantly male faculty with a faculty containing large numbers of women may be inflated by both the general underendowment of women colleges and differences in remuneration as a function of sex. At Connecticut College–until recently a women's college (male students were accepted in 1969)–sex differences in pay favoring men were found at every rank, even though women were *more* qualified than men in terms of professional experience and proportions holding the PhD.

Coeducational schools have found sex differences in pay within their institutions. The authors of a report on Kansas State Teachers College insist that:

> We must assume that there have been at least some minimal standards in placing individual faculty members within certain ranks, even if these standards have not been applied consistently among the various departments. Therefore, at least in theory, male instructors and female instructors should have essentially similar qualifications. If their qualifications are not essentially similar–that is, if there is a wide disparity in their qualifications, one of them is holding the wrong rank.

Six tables present the data on full-time faculty in a number of permutations, always revealing differences in pay by sex. College-wide, male professors average $1,771 more than female professors. Within the same departments, female faculty members receive lower average salaries than their male counterparts in 26 of 31 comparable cases. The largest gap in a department was a $2,084 differential in favor of males. Analysis of raises revealed that women not only are receiving fewer absolute dollars in their raise, but they are also receiving a lower percentage raise. Further, salaries of newly hired faculty showed that men were employed at a higher average salary for their rank than were women.

In another instance, seven tables and two graphs tell the story of pay differences at the University of Minnesota. Women's median pay was less in every instance (up to 22%) except for the rank of research associate where women made 5% more. Overall, women's median salary was 32% less than men's. When calculated by divisions, the range was from 7 to 57% less.

Although no summary is available, the numerous tables of salary comparisons indicate that women at the University of Southern Florida have been and still are being paid less than men.

No matter how the comparisons were made at the University of Washington, women's mean monthly salary rarely equaled men's. When all University academic personnel were considered, women earned 73% of the average male salary. Over the total teaching faculty (deans, department chairmen, and the five teaching ranks) pay ranged from 73 to 94% of the man's. Pay was most comparable for assistant professors.

At the University of Oregon, regular, 9-month, full-time faculty salaries were analyzed. Women averaged less pay at every rank. The biggest discrepancy was $2,081 for professors. University-wide, women earn $2,611 less than men. The professional schools differed significantly from the College of Liberal Arts. If a woman is part of the faculty of the College of Liberal Arts, she can expect to earn $4,460 less, whereas she earns $1,667 less in the professional schools.

One of the most sophisticated reports to date was made at the University of Indiana. Data on faculty salaries were compiled from the University payroll along with information on individuals' professional qualifications that might be expected to affect earnings–type of appointment, rank, division, level of education and experience. These factors plus sex were subjected to a "least squares" analysis both with the straight monthly salary and using the logarithm of salary as the dependent variable. They found, "...a woman equivalent to a man in terms of all other variables included in the regression equation could expect to earn about $100 per month less than a man."

A similar study conducted at the University of Illinois found that the mean female salary was less than the male's, regardless of rank and type of appointment (9 or 11 month). The mean female salary ranged from 76.2 to 99.6% of the mean male salary. As a result of these findings, a more detailed study was undertaken to identify significant factors determining salary level. They found that sex:

> ...significantly increased the predictability of salary...beyond that afforded by mean salary for department and rank, 9 or 11 month appointment information, and the multiple indices of experience and merit. The unstandardized regression coefficient for sex, 845.96, can be interpreted as the average yearly dollar value of masculinity in this sample.

Still another institution, the University of Colorado, Boulder, found overall discrepancies between the salaries of men and women of comparable rank. Moreover, the size of this discrepancy in favor of the men increased with rank. The fact that so many reports have focused on the financial aspect of discrimination indicates the increasing importance of this factor as a determinant of the status of women in higher education.

Administrative involvement

Women in administration is a separate topic altogether. Yet some coverage is warranted since many administrative posts are traditionally filled by faculty personnel (see Harris, 1970, and Bernard, 1964, for a general discussion of this aspect). Oltman's (1970a) findings in a study of 454 corporate members of the American Association of University Women indicate a conspicuous lack of participation by women in administrative areas.

> Women are most often found in positions which have minor relationship to policy-making and are at a middle-management level or which involve sex stereotypes...in 34 schools (all coeducational) there are no women department heads and the mean number of women department heads in all schools is less than 3 per institution...Women holding department chairmanships are found mostly in home economics, physical education, English, languages, nursing and education...Women at 35 percent of the schools are said to be represented on almost all faculty committees and boards...They are less likely to be represented on committees for guidance, scholarships, judicial problems, long

range planning, institutional research, admissions, educational or advisory policy, or to be advisers to campus organizations.

Of the coeducational campuses surveyed, 93 to 98% have had only men during the past 3 years in the positions of president, vice president, director of development and business manager; 82% have had men only in the positions of dean of students, director of counseling and college physician; 72 to 79% have had men only in the positions of associate or assistant academic dean, academic dean, director of placement and director of financial aid. Women trustees average one in eight over all the schools sampled.

Data from institutional reports were sparse. For the eight schools and one state system (nine Florida schools) from which participation figures in top administrative positions were available, the percentage of positions held by women ranged from 2 to 12. With respect to administration, two trends have been pointed out in reports: (1) the higher the position, the fewer the women; and (2) administrative units are headed by men and staffed by women.

An area of administration in which faculty is involved is the faculty governing body and its related committees, but information on women's participation is scarce. Henderson (1967) found that women were serving less and on less prestigious committees than men. Only seven campus reports mention committee participation, and comments reveal that it is very low. For example, over the past 10 years at the University of Chicago only two women appear on the list of university boards, committees and council appointments, of which there are 100 to 110 a year. And at the University of California, Berkeley, the percentage of women appointed to selected senate committees in the last 50 years ranged from zero to 1%. Their participation was zero on 12 and less than 1% on 22 of the 23 committees. Although the Chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh urged the inclusion of qualified women in the standing committees of the University Senate, the number of women increased by only one over an entire year.

Of course, many additional factors could be examined to determine whether they too have a differential impact on male and female faculty members. Other aspects considered in institutional reports include policies on "in-bred" hiring, nepotism, maternity leaves, sabbaticals, released time, leaves of absence, institutional grant funds, and fringe benefits such as child care facilities, insurance policies, health benefits, and retirement systems. Of these, policies on nepotism have so far received the greatest attention. As investigations continue, these factors, and others not now considered, may receive additional emphasis.

The criteria examined in this report—extent of participation, rank, departmental affiliation, tenure, exceptional appointment, initial appointment level, promotion, salary, and involvement in administration—have been the most frequently used bases, however, for current claims of sexual discrimination. The documentation of the inferior status of academic women in so many dimensions of institutional policy and at so many schools gives credence to the observation that sexual discrimination affects more than just the female academic "elite," as Bernard suggested. Information gathering and publication on this topic is in its beginning stages, and the number of new and continuing projects listed in the third section of this report indicates there is much more to follow.

Table 2. Institutions included in computations and/or discussions of status criteria

	Total faculty Coed	Total Non-Coed	Rank	Department	Tenure	Exceptional Appts.	Initial Appt. Level	Promotion	Salary	Administrative Positions	Committees
University of Arizona	X			X					X		
Amherst College		M									
Assumption College		M									
Boston College	X										
Boston University	X										
Brandeis University	X		X								
Brooklyn College (CUNY)			X	X							
Brown University-Pembroke College	X		X								
California State College at Fullerton	X		X	X							
University of California, Berkeley	X		X	X				X			X
Los Angeles			X								
Carnegie-Mellon University			X								
University of Chicago	X		X		X	X		X			X
Clark University	X										
University of Colorado, Boulder									X		
Columbia University			X	X		X			X		
Connecticut College		W*						X	X		
Eastern Illinois University	X					X	X	X			
State University System of Florida										X	
Florida International University											
Florida Technological University	X		X								
University of South Florida	X		X		X		X		X		X
University of West Florida	X										
Florida Atlantic University	X										
Florida State University	X										
Florida A & M University	X										
University of Northern Florida											
University of Florida	X										
Harvard University	X		X		X	X					
Holy Cross College		M									
University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana	X		X	X				X	X	X	X
Indiana University, Bloomington	X		X		X				X		
Kansas State Teachers College	X		X	X					X		
University of Kansas, Lawrence	X		X	X							
University of Maryland, College Park			X	X	X					X	
Baltimore Campus	X		X		X					X	
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	X										
University of Massachusetts, Amherst	X										
Boston	X										
University of Miami			X								
University of Michigan	X		X		X						
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities	X		X						X		
Mount Holyoke College		W									
University of New Hampshire	X										
State University of New York, Buffalo	X		X	X	X					X	X
Northeastern University	X										
University of Oregon	X		X	X		X			X	X	
Pace College			X	X				X			
University of Pittsburgh			X	X			X			X	X
University of Rhode Island	X										

Table 2. (Continued)

	Total faculty Coed	Total Non-Coed	Rank	Department	Tenure	Exceptional Appts.	Initial Appt. Level	Promotion	Salary	Administrative Positions	Committees
Rutgers University System				X**							
Rutgers											
Douglass (New Brunswick)					X						
Livingston											
Rutgers, Newark											
College of South Jersey, Camden					X						
Sacramento State College	X			X		X				X	X
San Diego State College	X										
Salem State College	X										
Simmons College		W									
Smith College		W		X							
Stanford University	X		X		X	X					
Tufts University-Jackson College	X										
University of Washington	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		
Wayne State University			X	X							
Wellesley College		W									
University of Wisconsin, Madison				X							
Yale College	X		X								

*Note: Connecticut College became coed in 1969.

**Graduate faculty.

ANNOTATED CAMPUS REPORTS

University of Arizona. Sigworth, Heather. "Supplemental letter on the University of Arizona." July 1970, 5 pp. HE 001 891. (This document is available at the Clearinghouse only.)

This report focuses on the following three conditions at the University: female-male faculty ratios do not reflect the availability of trained women; the University of Arizona does not graduate women PhDs in a proportion commensurate with its graduate enrollment or with the national average; and the consequences of an "anti-nepotism" rule have not been rectified. Most of the report consists of figures supporting the first statement. The percentages of female faculty and female graduate students are given for selected departments. Graduate students are used for comparison based on the contention that the number of available female PhDs nationally is not the only guide to the availability of trained female academics. The composition of the Arizona faculty including data on the degrees held by its men supports this contention. Several other comparisons are made to demonstrate the utilization of women at Arizona. The report concludes with a call for a comprehensive study and establishment of a body designated to implement actions designed to increase the status of women.

Amherst College. Achbar, Francine and Bishop, Pam. "Harvard Probed for Discrimination against Women," *Boston Herald Traveler* 3, April 5, 1970.

The views of higher education personnel on women's roles, women and education, and women and work appear along with a survey of 21 New England colleges. Data were collected for Boston College, Northeastern University, University of Massachusetts (Amherst), Boston University, Harvard University-Radcliffe College, University of Rhode Island, University of New Hampshire, University of Massachusetts (Boston), Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Tufts University-Jackson College, Brandeis University, Salem State College, Clark University, Brown University-Pembroke College, Amherst College, Assumption College, Holy Cross College, Mount Holyoke College, Smith College, Simmons College and Wellesley College. A chart accompanying this article contains information on: number of undergraduate males and females, number of graduate males and females, total full-time faculty, total tenured faculty, total women faculty, total tenured women faculty, number of top administrative positions, and number of top women administrators.

Assumption College. See Amherst College or Achbar and Bishop, 1970.

Boston College. See Amherst College or Achbar and Bishop, 1970.

Boston University. See Amherst College or Achbar and Bishop, 1970.

Brandeis University. Murray, Pauli. "Statement of Dr. Pauli Murray, Professor of American Studies Brandeis University," *Discrimination Against Women: Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor.* Washington: House of Representatives, June 1970, pp. 328-41. Copies may be obtained from senators and congressmen.

This testimony opens with a general discussion of sexual discrimination. In response to the Committee's request for documentation of prima facie evidence of discrimination against women on college faculties, two types of data for Brandeis were provided: (1) a comparative study of male and female honor graduates of the University over a period of years; and (2) a comparative study of male and female faculty members by rank at the same University. Such data were presented for the purposes of revealing the potential academic resources compared by sex and the degree to which this potential is fulfilled at the faculty level. Figures for Brandeis show that the source of female excellence is not being utilized at the faculty level. Murray closes with several legislative recommendations.

See also, Amherst College or Achbar and Bishop, 1970.

Brooklyn College, CUNY. Babey-Brooke, Anna M. and Amber, R.B. "Discrimination against Women in Higher Education. A 15-Year Survey. Promotional Practices at Brooklyn College CUNY: 1955-1970, All Ranks-Tenured and Untenured." July 1970, 26 pp. ED 044 089. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

This report consists primarily of departmental tables showing both the number and the percentages of men and women faculty by rank from 1955 to 1970. Each presentation is accompanied by notes which summarize or explain various aspects of the preceding tables. The notes or comments following the tables on the art department, for example, go something like: from 1955 to 1970, only one woman was given tenure in the art department until 1968. Three women were appointed after Babey-Brooke's initial charges of discrimination were made. One of these women was later denied tenure despite being recommended by the Appointments Committee and her chairman. From 1962 to 1970, the art department was favored in promotions; the department has a high percentage of professors and associate professors.

A total of 19 departments are covered. The last three tables compare three departments in the arts (education, English and speech) with three in the sciences (biology, chemistry and physics). The first table includes percentages by sex in the senior ranks for the six departments over 15 years. The second shows the ratio of men to women in the six departments for two periods, 1955-56 and 1968-70, and the net gain or loss by sex. Table three shows, by sex, the greatest and least number of faculty in the six departments. Comments follow. Two pages of remarks covering individual situations, specific departments, and general trends conclude the report.

Brown University-Pembroke College. Lamphere, Louise, et al. "Report of the AAUP Committee on the Employment and Status of Women Faculty and Women Graduate Students at Brown." October 1970, 22 pp. ED 045 061. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

This report is in six sections covering: numbers and percentages of women faculty, salaries of women faculty, questionnaire results from department chairmen and women faculty, interviews with women faculty and women graduate students, overview and discussion, and resolutions and recommendations. The first section discusses and presents statistics on women in full-time and part-time employment according to position or rank and year. Salary data are inconclusive. For example, no sex comparisons can be made since the data are not separated by sex. The questionnaire for departmental chairmen sought such information as: the proportion of women faculty by rank in the department; actual hiring of women in the past 5 years; hiring procedures; attitudes toward various forms of nepotism; number of women graduate students, teaching assistants, teaching associates and research assistants; and admission and financial aid for graduate study. Women faculty respondents were a diverse group in terms of rank and years of service. Attitudes were surveyed toward treatment by their colleagues, tenure and promotion, treatment by their department, prospects for leaving, type of appointment and salaries. Nepotism policies seem to be the thorniest problem. Interviews with women faculty centered around problems with initial appointments and career obstacles. Both faculty and students emphasized problems encountered by married women. Recommendations include equal fringe benefits, paid maternity leave, day-care centers, compensatory hiring, adoption of hiring practices independent of sex and marriage, appointment of women to regular instead of special ranks, and a reaffirmation of support for women in their career goals.

See also, Amherst College or Achbar and Bishop, 1970, and Harris, 1970.

California State College at Fullerton. Bratfisch, Virginia, et al. "A Report on the Status of Women at the California State College at Fullerton." June 29, 1970, 18 pp. ED 045 044. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

This report was prepared in response to a request by the Chancellor of the California State Colleges. It presents "An analysis of the status of women at the California State College at Fullerton," and discusses what the state colleges must do to end discrimination against women. After a general introduction, statistics are cited on faculty and students that indicate discriminatory practices towards women. Comments from interviews with administrative

staff members are included as well as a discussion of two tables containing the data. Table 1 shows the numbers and percentages of men and women by academic level during the Fall 1968, from freshmen to full professor. Table 2 contains the number of men and women faculty by rank and tenure for 28 departments. The number of graduate degrees awarded at California State College, Fullerton for the 1959-69 decade are delineated by sex. A discussion of attitudes held toward women's problems at the Health Center, the Placement Office and the Student Testing and Counseling Office follows. The second section discusses actions needed to comply with federal contract requirements with respect to sexual discrimination.

University of California, Berkeley. "Report of the Subcommittee on the Status of Academic Women on the Berkeley Campus." Berkeley: The Academic Senate, May 19, 1970, 79 pp. ED 042 413. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

Following the most extensive study of the status of women done to date on a university campus, the Subcommittee concluded "all sources indicate that the fears of academic women that they will be denied equal opportunities and recognition are grounded in hard facts." Their statement is short and succinct and includes conclusions, recommendations, and a discussion of the background leading to the recommendations.

The 15 appendices which form the basis for the recommendations cover: nepotism, percentage of women at different academic levels, employment rates of women of different educational levels, number of men and women on active faculty status at different ranks and in selected departments through the years, comparative rates of promotion and attrition of men and women on the Berkeley faculty, 1920-70, examination of the University of California insurance systems for possible discrimination against women, committees of the Berkeley division of the academic senate, admission to the graduate division, financial support of graduate students, number of degrees awarded to women by decade and field, relative success of women in obtaining degrees, award of doctorates in distinguished departments (other than Berkeley), number of years to obtain the doctorate, results of a survey of graduate women students that includes difficulties encountered and suggestions for change, and the status of women in research units.

University of California, Los Angeles. See Harris, 1970.

Carnegie-Mellon University. "Survey Broken Down by Sex of Carnegie-Mellon University Appointments at an Academic Level Higher than Graduate Student. Taken from the Official Published Directory for 1969-70." [1970], 1 p. HE 001 891.

A one-page chart covers University appointments above the graduate student level for the 1969-70 academic year. The number of faculty is listed by school, rank, and sex. Four explanatory notes accompany the table.

University of Chicago. "Women in the University of Chicago. Report of the Committee on University Women." Chicago: The University Senate, May 1, 1970, 125 pp. ED 041 537. MF-$0.65, HC-$6.58.

A Committee on University Women was appointed to inquire into the status and opportunities open to academic women on campus, with special attention given to the question of equity of salaries, promotions, and tenure for faculty women. After 1 year of operation, a 121-page report was produced of which at least one-half concerned women students. A Committee study to ascertain the comparability of salaries discovered no significant differences, but the study design cast some doubt on whether the results could be considered conclusive. The Committee also claimed that the necessary data to evaluate promotions and tenure did not exist.

The report contains a discussion of an investigation into three cases of alleged discrimination, and it concludes from interviews with substantial groups of faculty women that the women were satisfied with their situation. The two elements of malaise most frequently mentioned included possible salary differentials and isolation from their colleagues. From a comparison of the number of regular teaching faculty by academic unit (divisions, colleges and schools), rank, and sex to the pool of talent available, the Committee concluded that more women of distinction could have been Chicago faculty members. Other topics covered were nepotism, tandem teams (husband and wife teaching), child care, the positions of lecturer and research associate, and the work patterns of faculty women. The overall impression gained by the Committee was that there were "no glaring inequities."

Clark University. See Amherst College or Achbar and Bishop, 1970.

University of Colorado, Boulder. Minturn, Leigh. "Inequities in Salary Payments to Faculty Women." May 25, 1970, 6 pp. ED 045 045. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

This memorandum discusses the methods used in computing the salary statistics, major findings, and the rationale for correcting inequities. Three tables accompany the text. The first shows salaries of the arts and sciences faculty for 1969-70 by sex, rank, and various statistical computations such as the mean and median. The second shows the distribution of women by rank over the salary range. The third shows the mean salaries of women by rank in terms of their length of service. An overall discrepancy between the salaries of men and women of comparable rank was found. The size of this discrepancy increased with rank. In no case was a woman earning the lowest salary of her rank. Finally, those women in rank for lengthy periods of service made little more than those more recently appointed. At the full professor level, new appointees made more.

Columbia University. Duplessis, Rachel, et al. "Columbia Women's Liberation: Report from the Committee on

Discrimination against Women Faculty," *Barnard Alumnae* 59, Spring 1970, pp. 12-18.

Duplessis, Rachel, et al. "Columbia Women's Liberation: Report from the Committee on Discrimination against Women Faculty," *The Radical Teacher,* December 30, 1969, pp. 29-35. Copies may be obtained from the New University Conference, 622 West Diversey Parkway, Chicago, Illinois 60614, $1.00.

A five woman committee from the Columbia Women's Liberation group (formed in the spring of 1969) prepared a report on the status of women faculty at Columbia University. Measuring the proportion of female faculty in different ranks, the committee also considered the number of PhDs granted to women, the time period in which the degree was awarded, and the normal time table of an academic career. They found fewer women than expected in the upper ranks. Overall, the greatest concentration was in the lower ranks, and largely confined to Barnard, the General Studies and the Graduate Faculties within the University. Women constitute the majority of only one category – part-time employment. The report examines the role of Barnard as an equalizer in the otherwise male-dominated Columbia community, both with respect to differences in pay of those with equal titles, and the sex of those in positions of prestige at the College. The Graduate Faculties come under scrutiny next. Of ten departments studied, only one hires women in the same proportion as they are granted degrees.

The report recommends that the University: prepare a full study of the position of women faculty in the University; declare its unequivocal support of the right of women to equal employment consonant with their ability, and of equal pay for that employment; engage in discussion of child care and paid leave for childbirth for all employees; and create a Committee on Employment Practices that would hear reports of alleged discrimination and investigate hiring patterns of departments and divisions.

Connecticut College. Torrey, Jane W., Evans, Elizabeth, and Doro, Marion. "Report to AAUP by Committee W on the Status of Women at Connecticut College." 1970, 3 pp. HE 001 891.

The AAUP chapter conducted a study of the salary and promotion records of the faculty at the College. The report opens with a summary of the findings and actions.

Six tables contain the data collected. Table 1 contains the salaries in the first year of appointment or pomotion to each rank by sex. Women were paid less than men in all ranks – that of assistant professor being the least different and that of professor being the most. Table 2 shows the percentages of men and women holding the PhD at the time of appointment to rank. For each rank, women were more likely to have the PhD. Table 3 presents the mean number of years from the PhD degree to appointment to each rank by sex. On the average, women held the degree longer before attaining each rank. Women waited 4½ years longer between the PhD degree and the rank of full professor. Table 4 contains the mean number of years of professional experience before appointment to each rank by sex. Table 5 gives the mean number of years women and men have held their present ranks. Women spent a longer time at one rank than did men. Table 6 shows the percentage of women out of the total faculty in each rank for 1963 and 1969. Since 1963, the percentage of women in each rank has decreased.

Chapter efforts to redress the differentials are summarized.

Eastern Illinois University. "Discrimination against Women Teachers at Eastern Illinois University." 1970, 2 pp. HE 001 891.

This two-page, eight-paragraph report ranges over a number of aspects concerning the status of women faculty on campus. Short synopses are presented on administration and enrollment, the instructional staff, patterns of hiring in all departments (1969-70), patterns of hiring in selected departments, distribution of women teachers by rank, promotions, salaries and accounts of the state of affairs in one specific department.

State University System of Florida. "State University System of Florida." April 1970, 1 p. HE 001 891.

A one-page chart covers statistics on nine Florida institutions. The numbers of men and women in various administrative and faculty positions are provided along with the percentage of each sex in the student body and total faculty.

University of South Florida. Mackay, Maxine. "Status of Women Committee: Faculty Report." November 1970, 31 pp. HE 002 088 (RIE July 71); MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

This report summarizes data on the status of women from six sources and across time. It is intended to serve as an interim report since the study on women is continuing. The report was prepared by the AAUP Committee on the Employment Status of Women. The report begins by citing the need for such a study and includes a description of the study and dossier preparation used to gather information on University academic women. The first three sources cover data which became available in 1969 – *Institutional Research Report No. 46,* the *1970-71 Bulletin* and the *University Planning Report No. 4.* The first source discusses data on degrees held, amount of professional experience, ranks held, salary earned, and incremental increases in salary. The second covers some of the same data but in tabular form. Areas covered include rank, degrees, and administrative positions held. The third source includes ranks held within colleges, mean and median salary for administrative and teaching personnel by rank, the mean and median salary for ranks in the colleges, and the number of women above or below the college and University salary average. Sources four through six cover data from 1970 and include an updated staff list, figures from the "New Faculty Lists for 1970-71" and a summary of the questionnaire

results. The fourth source contains updated figures on degrees held, the number of men and women by colleges and the mean salary for administrative and teaching personnel by rank or position held. The fifth compares those newly hired by college and rank. The sixth source summarizes data from 82 completed questionnaires from University faculty women and covers summer work, experience, years in field, tenure, administrative responsibility, University and department committee work, teaching load, salaries, publications and grants, community activities, financial responsibilities, and responses to stereotypic statements about career women. Specific and general recommendations follow. The report generally found women relegated to lower ranks and being paid less.

Harvard University. "Harvard Statistics." 1969, 7 pp. HE 001 891.

This report is primarily graphic, presenting statistics on eight schools – the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, the School of Medicine and Dental Medicine, the School of Divinity, the Graduate School of Design, the School of Public Health, the School of Law, the School of Business Administration, and the School of Education. Each graph indicates the ratio of women to total persons in various faculty and staff positions. The percentage of women students in each school is also given.

"Preliminary Report on the Status of Women at Harvard." March 9, 1970, 16 pp. ED 043 299. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

Three major sections comprise this report: (1) the participation of women in the faculty, administration, and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences; (2) reasons for reviewing the status of women at Harvard; (3) a suggested composition and topic outline for any future faculty committee investigating the problem. The discussion of faculty focuses on the preponderance of females in the lower level and exceptional ("outside the *real* system") appointments. It refers to statistics pertaining to all of Harvard for two time periods, 1959-60 and 1968-69. The section on administration covers four problems that concern women who hold Corporation Appointments – lower ranks, lesser titles for equivalent positions, differences in eligibility to attend faculty meetings, and suspected pay differentials. Both admission policies and attrition rates are discussed with respect to students in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

The report contains a policy memorandum circulated to Princeton departmental chairmen concerning part-time professorial appointments.

See also, Amherst College or Achbar and Bishop, 1970, and Bynum and Martin, 1970.

Holy Cross College. See Amherst College or Achbar and Bishop, 1970.

University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana. Ferber, Marianne and Loeb, Jane. "Rank, Pay, and Representation of Women on the Faculty of the Champaign-Urbana Campus of the University of Illinois." November 1970, 28 pp. ED 045 011. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

A preliminary report on the status of women at the University of Illinois was presented to the Urbana AAUP Chapter in the spring of 1970. Following up the preliminary findings, this report addresses itself to five questions. (1) Is the number of women appointed to administrative positions commensurate with their number on the faculty? (2) Is the number of women on the faculty commensurate with the number available in the labor market? (3) Are women on the average less productive than men, so that rational recruitment and promotion policies might concentrate on men? (4) Are the salaries and ranks of women commensurate with their experience and productivity? (5) Is the rate at which women are advanced through the ranks commensurate with their experience and productivity? The study's findings indicate that the answer to all these questions is no.

In order to investigate the latter three questions, a questionnaire was administered to a sample of 186 faculty women and 186 faculty men matched on the basis of department and rank. Data on department, rank, number of years at each rank, highest degree, date of degree, age, sex, number of seven types of publications, years of experience, number of honors, contract status and salary were solicited. Using statistical techniques, the relationship of experience, productivity and sex to both rank and pay were examined. After indices of merit and experience had been considered, sex-based rank and pay inequities remained.

Indiana University, Bloomington. Berry, Sara and Erenburg, Mark. "Earnings of Professional Women at Indiana University." [1969], 21 pp. ED 043 292. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

Differences in salaries as a function of sex were examined. Various factors that determine qualifications for teaching and research were taken into account: type of appointment (faculty or faculty-administration), rank, school in which appointment was held, and professional experience. These independent variables were entered into a regression analysis using both the salary and logarithm of salary as dependent variables. A significant difference in salary as a function of sex was found. After demonstrating the general order of magnitude of the difference between men's and women's salaries, the authors analyzed separately the effect of the independent variables on the salaries of each sex.

Kansas State Teachers College. "Report 1 of the Committee on the Status of Women." [1970], 16 pp. ED 043 310. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

This report contains a salary study and a copy of a law enacted by the Kansas state legislature. The 1970 law provides equal pay for equal work, regardless of sex.

The Committee focused on faculty who held full-time positions. Six tables and a summary of the findings cover

the salaries of KSTC faculty in detail. The tables include college-wide and departmental comparisons of 9-month salaries (1969-70) by rank and sex. Faculty salaries above and below the maximum and minimum levels suggested by the Regents are shown by sex and department. Another table illustrates sex differences indicated by average percentage and absolute dollar raises over 1968-69 salaries. Two other tables, college-wide and departmental, cover salaries for new full-time faculty hired. This detailed analysis reveals consistent and persistent salary inequities as a function of sex. Six recommendations for action on the part of the local AAUP chapter are made.

University of Kansas, Lawrence. "Reports of Associated Women Students Commission on the Status of Women: 1969-1970." [1970], 30 pp. ED 043 315. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

Three tables present figures on the faculty composition by sex. One refers to school, another to departments in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the third to administrative positions. The report is mainly concerned, however, with the status of women students in various departments.

University of Maryland, Baltimore. The New University Conference. "The Status of Women at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County." April 1970, 9 pp. HE 001 891.

The first part of this report contains five tables with figures on the full-time personnel on campus. Included are: (1) percentage of faculty women by rank and division; (2) percentages of women on the faculty for 3 years and percentage of new faculty who are women for 2 years; (3) number and percentage of women in various decision-making positions; (4) number of staff employees by position and sex; and (5) proportion of men and women at different ranks.

The second part is a memorandum to the faculty, staff, and assembly members on sexual discrimination in University practice. It provides the background for the resolutions and motions presented in the next section, which includes 12 resolutions along with justifying statements. Some resolutions specify a means of implementation. The fourth section repeats the 12 resolutions plus one additional, but omits accompanying arguments.

University of Maryland, College Park. Sandler, Bernice. "Sex Discrimination at the University of Maryland." Fall 1969, 12 pp. ED 041 565. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

The discussion centers around staffing patterns as a function of sex. Employment patterns within the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education are summarized on the basis of tenure, rank, and number of graduate women students. An inverse relationship between rank and the proportion of women is noted. The appendix contains statistics on 15 departments in the College of Arts and Sciences and six departments in the College of Education. For each department, the percentage of women is listed at each appointment level from graduate student (when available) through full professor. Also, the numbers of women holding top-level positions in six administrative areas are given.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology. See Amherst College or Achbar and Bishop, 1970.

University of Massachusetts, Amherst and Boston. See Amherst College or Achbar and Bishop, 1970.

University of Miami. "UM Faculty Dominated by Males," *The Miami Herald,* April 12, 1970.

This article documents the numbers of men and women in various segments of the University. Deans, teachers, staffs in individual schools and the library are mentioned. The number of teachers is given by rank.

University of Michigan. Shortridge, Kathy. ["Women at the University of Michigan."] May 28, 1970, 5 pp. HE 001 891.

A women's group in Ann Arbor prepared this press release on the status of women at the University to explain the rationale behind their formal complaint filed with the U.S. Department of Labor. The report discusses freshman admission policy, undergraduate retention rates, patterns of graduate attendance, number of women in professorial ranks, the pattern of employment of women in teaching positions and status of women in staff positions. Charts summarize: (1) the total professorial staff (professors, associates and assistants) in various schools for Fall 1969 and (2) the number of faculty women by rank for the same schools.

See also, Shortridge, 1970.

University of Minnesota. Truax, Anne, et al. "Research on the Status of Faculty Women, University of Minnesota." May 1970, 15 pp. ED 041 564. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

This report was submitted by the Minnesota Planning and Counseling Center at the request of the vice presidents and focuses on faculty salary comparisons. The purpose of the study was to compare and analyze the number, rank, salary, and term of appointment of full-time faculty men and women at the University. Charts and graphs present salary figures for various groups based on October 1969 payroll figures. A table for the distribution of faculty members by rank for the combined campuses contained the only data covering more than the Twin Cities' campus. Data on the Twin Cities' campus were extensive and included figures on women's median salary expressed in percentages less than men's by rank and by college. Comparisons were also made of mean and median monthly salaries and the numbers of men and women by rank, college and term of appointment. No discussion or summary of the data appears. However, in 21 of 22 comparisons, women were paid less. This data compilation represents the first of a planned two-part study.

Mount Holyoke College. See Amherst College or Achbar and Bishop, 1970.

University of New Hampshire. See Amherst College or Achbar and Bishop, 1970.

State University of New York at Buffalo. Scott, Ann. "The Half-Eaten Apple: A Look at Sex Discrimination in the University," *Reporter,* May 14, 1970, 26 pp. ED 041 566. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

This report can be divided into four major topic areas: a discussion of the status of women in general, a discussion of the status of women in higher education, a description and discussion of the status of women at SUNY/Buffalo and the presentation of an action plan for adoption at SUNY/ Buffalo.

The data for the study of Buffalo were gathered from a number of sources. One was a questionnaire sent to every department soliciting the numbers of full-time men and women according to rank and tenure and the numbers of men and women full-time graduate students currently enrolled and subsidized. Also requested were tenured and non-tenured faculty by sex and length of service. Nine tables cover the information from the above survey plus other data.

Tables contain the following information about SUNY/ Buffalo: (1) numbers and percentages of women and men by academic level; (2) percentages of men and women by rank in each college; (3) percentages of men and women faculty compared with graduate students by college; (4) number of men and women by rank in each college; (5) number and percentages of men and women faculty, tenured faculty, graduate students and subsidized graduate students in each department; (6) number of full-time graduate students by sex in each college; (7) administrative salaries by degree, age and sex; (8) numbers and percentages of students in various enrollment statuses (full-time, part-time, full-time non-credit and part-time non-credit) by sex and class level; and (9) number and percentages of full time undergraduates by sex and class.

Practices such as nepotism rules, inbred-hiring policies, tenure procedures, committee appointments, part-time study regulations and subject matter content, are taken to task for their differential impact on women. The action plan sets forth specific operations and procedures by which a university can implement the goal of eliminating discrimination.

Northeastern University. See Amherst College or Achbar and Bishop, 1970.

University of Oregon. Acker, Joan, et al. "The Status of Women at the University of Oregon. Report of an Ad Hoc Committee." 1970, 20 pp. HE 001 914 (RIE May 71); MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

The first section of this report contains statistics on the current position of women at Oregon; the second describes a survey of faculty women; and the third presents ten recommendations for University action. In the first section, tabular data on the faculty are presented. Table 1 shows the percentage of women who comprise each rank for the entire faculty and for the full-time, 9-month teaching staff. Table 2 shows the percentages of each sex who hold a given rank. Table 3 gives the proportion of females to total faculty in various departments within the College of Liberal Arts and professional schools for 1930, 1940, 1950, 1960, 1965 and 1969-70. Table 4 summarizes requests for authorization to hire for the 1969-70 year by sex, position and salary. Table 5 shows the mean salary by rank of men and women in the College of Liberal Arts, professional schools and the total University. Table 6 does not appear. For selected departments, Table 7 compares the percentages of women faculty and graduate students with the percentage of PhDs awarded women nationally. The data are accompanied by discussion. A paragraph on the participation of women in the University's administration is included. In summary, the statistics showed:

> Women are a small proportion of the faculty; they are underrepresented at the higher faculty level; there is considerable segregation of women in certain schools and departments; their pay is on the average lower than that of men; data on 1969-70 hiring indicate no change in these patterns; they are underrepresented in the Administration.

The faculty survey in the second section includes 68 responses to 103 solicitations. Data are presented on the professional characteristics of respondents including highest degree held, time since last degree, rank, mobility, stability, recruitment, time spent in teaching, research and administration, publications and marital status. Reports of discrimination are analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively. Four career patterns are identified and described – Mainstream Professionals, Marginal Professional, Neo-traditional Hopefuls and Permanent Peripherals.

Recommendations focus on eliminating explicit barriers to the hiring and promotion of women and finding ways in which greater flexibility in and greater choice of productive and satisfying career patterns might be fostered.

Pace College. "Pace College Faculty." 1970, 14 pp. HE 001 891.

Several tables provide descriptive statistics on faculty staffing patterns. Table 1 shows the numbers of men and women faculty members in five ranks for the years 1952-70. Table 2 provides similar information by department for the period 1954-70. Table 3 gives the percentage of males and females by department for 1966-70. Table 4 follows the rank of staff members in four departments over the period of 1952-70. Each table is accompanied by explanatory remarks.

University of Pittsburgh. University Committee for Women's Rights. "Discrimination against Women at the University of Pittsburgh." November 1970, 70 pp. HE 002 089 (RIE July 71); MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

This report documents the activities of the University Committee for Women's Rights (UCWR) over a 1-year

period. The chapters cover UCWR's negotiations with the University, summarize the data compiled and present proposals for improving the condition of women. Data on faculty include men and women faculty in eight selected departments by rank, new faculty appointments for 14 schools by rank, participation rates in the standing committees of the University Senate for 2 years, and the percentage of each faculty positions held by women. Other chapters include an introduction to UCWR, UCWR attempts to review salaries, discrimination against women students, UCWR's interaction with the administration, women in staff positions, UCWR's efforts in relation to the law, and a summary of obstacles UCWR met in pursuing its goals.

"Number of Women Holding Top Level Administrative Positions at the University of Pittsburgh." 1969, 1 page. HE 001 891.

Information on the staffing pattern in seven administrative positions is given.

University of Rhode Island. See Amherst College or Achbar and Bishop, 1970.

Rutgers College. "Statistics of Rutgers College." 1970, 7 pp. HE 001 891.

This report contains an array of statistics covering the staffing pattern of faculty in the Rutgers system (the State University of New Jersey). The schools covered in the system include: Rutgers, Douglass and Livingston Colleges in New Brunswick, the College of South Jersey (Rutgers-Camden), and Rutgers-Newark. Selected departments in the total graduate faculty are also included. The data provide information on the number and percentage of women faculty by tenure, rank and departmental affiliation. The percentage of doctorates awarded U.S. women in selected fields are compared to the percentage of women faculty employed in those fields.

Sacramento State College. "Statistics on Women at Sacramento State College." 1970, 2 pp. HE 001 891.

The numbers and percentages of full-time and part-time faculty women are given for 17 departments. Figures also appear on the number of women full-time faculty, full and part-time nonacademic employees, department chairmen, administrators, and academic senators. Also documented is the percentage of women receiving research funds, released time, creative leaves, and sabbaticals.

San Diego State College. Jancek, Camilla. "Women in Teaching at San Diego State College, 1968-69." [1969], 2 pp. HE 001 891.

This report discusses the status of women faculty members including the hiring and promotional practices of four departments. Each departmental discussion is accompanied by figures on the number of men and women in the top three ranks. Data for the entire institution by rank are also provided.

Salem State College. See Amherst College or Achbar and Bishop, 1970.

Simmons College. See Amherst College or Achbar and Bishop, 1970.

Smith College. Data drawn from personal correspondence to Dr. Florence Howe, Goucher College, Towson, Maryland 21204. March 16, 1970, 4 pp. HE 001 891.

Two tables provide data on Smith administrative and faculty personnel. The first compares the number of men and women faculty members by rank in eight large departments for 1961-62 and 1968-69. The second compares the men and women faculty and administrators by rank for the same time periods.

See also, Amherst College or Achbar and Bishop, 1970.

Stanford University. Siegel, Alberta E. and Carr, Ronald G. "Education of Women at Stanford University," in *The Study of Education at Stanford: A Report to the University* 7, March 1969, pp. 81-100. ED 032 849. MF-$0.65, HC – Not available from EDRS. Copies may be obtained from the Study of Education at Stanford, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305.

This report appears as an appendix in a volume of *The Study of Education at Stanford.* The content on faculty women at Stanford comprises one-fifth of the chapter. Women students are the focus of the report, and the history of higher education of American women, current trends in the education of American women, and trends in life patterns of American women are main topics. Information on the faculty comes under the current trends section, and the discussion centers around the rank of professorial faculty. The majority of faculty women, "31 of the 49, are placed at the lowest of the three ranks – assistant professor. Women comprise nearly 10 percent of Stanford's assistant professors, but less than 2 percent of the professors." Neither age nor marital status could account for the differentials found in rank. Two other explanations were offered but not explored in depth: women's subject specializations are in fields with limited opportunity for promotion at Stanford; and women are more devoted to teaching and less to research productivity. Concluding recommendations state that Stanford should foster the provision of diverse role models on campus for women students and should further review the status of faculty women, especially with respect to appointment and promotion policies.

Tufts University-Jackson College. See Amherst College or Achbar and Bishop, 1970.

University of Washington. "Report on the Status of Women at the University of Washington; Part 1: Faculty and Staff." October 1970, 48 pp. ED 045 060. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

This extensive report compiled by the Associated

Students' Women's Commission, covers both the faculty and staff at the University. Thirteen tables plus statistics incorporated into the text contain a great deal of information on the status of faculty women.

Under "Numbers and Location" data are provided for men and women on rank, tenure, staffing patterns in the graduate faculty, departments and schools, and the numbers and location of graduate students. "Availability for Hiring" includes data on three potential hiring pools for faculty: the numbers of men and women who earned degrees from the 11 leading American universities in 25 fields over two 5-year intervals, the percentages of doctorates awarded to women in selected fields nationally, and the doctorates earned by University of Washington women in 1969-70 in selected fields. Information on the rank of new appointments comes under "Hiring." "Promotion" analyzes factors regarding sex differences in promotion and time in rank. Figures for the mean monthly salary for full-time faculty appear in "Salary." The data appear in a number of permutations: by positions (e.g., deans, department chairmen and ranks), by schools and colleges, by rank and schools combined, and by bar graphs of groups and ranks. "Channeled Fields" analyzes staffing patterns, taking into account the areas of study traditionally considered "women's professions." "Positions of Power" covers women's participation in the faculty senate, faculty council, department chairmanships, and deanships. Women in relation to "Research and Special Facilities" and "Nepotism and Part-time Employment" complete the section on faculty women. The rest of the report covers the status of University staff personnel.

The researchers found that the higher the rank, the fewer the women. A smaller percentage of females had tenure than males, and women were under-utilized in terms of indices of availability. Further, women had lower initial appointment levels, slower promotions, and less salary, power and security because of nepotism rules or part-time status.

Wayne State University. "Fact Sheet for Wayne State University." 1970, 5 pp. HE 001 891.

The first page of this report covers various trends in employment of women at Wayne State. A table of the percentage of all faculty and newly hired faculty at each rank is presented by sex. Three tables cover 1968-69 and 1969-70 full-time academic employees for the College of Liberal Arts and the 1968-69 full-time academic employees in the College of Education. The variables tabulated include departmental affiliation, rank, and sex.

Wellesley College. See Amherst College or Achbar and Bishop, 1970.

University of Wisconsin, Madison. "University of Wisconsin, Madison Campus 1969-70." [1970], 2 pp. HE 001 891.

Figures for men and women in 15 departments within the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences, the School of Education, the College of Letters and Science, and the School of Medicine are given by rank.

Women's Research Group. *Women at Wisconsin.* [1969], 20 pp. Copies may be obtained from the National Organization for Women, 218 Front Street, Beaver Dam, Wisconsin 53916, Attention: Gene Boyer, $0.20.

This pamphlet is devoted primarily to women students. It deals with: "The Fate of Wisconsin Female Graduates (B.A./B.S.)," "Off-Limits Careers for Women," and "Women Graduate Students: Privileged Preparation for a Poor Position." The data on and discussion of faculty members appear in the section on graduate students. The percentage of women students and faculty and the number of men and women by rank are given for selected departments.

Yale College. "Yale Faculty." 1970, 1 p. HE 001 891.

Tables illustrate the total and the female membership of the Yale College faculty by rank for the years 1963 through 1970.

DIRECTORY OF PROJECTS

American Anthropological Association (AAA). Direct inquiries to: Patricia S. Lander, c/o Department of Anthropology, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027.

The Committee on the Role of Women in Anthropology became a standing committee within the AAA in February 1970. It now has nine members and is chaired by Patricia S. Lander (York-CUNY). The Committee compiled a list of women in anthropology and distributed it to various foundations to encourage the selection of women for their review boards. The Committee has also established files on career patterns of professional women, in general, and in the social sciences and anthropology, in particular, and bibliographical items on female roles cross-culturally. They are conducting a study of "drop-outs" from the Department of Anthropology, Columbia University to determine, among other things, the reasons for female withdrawal from the program. Also, a questionnaire is being sent to a sample of the entire membership before the annual meeting to gather information on career patterns, problems, satisfactions and dissatisfactions. The Committee now has several discrimination complaints on which it plans to take action. Results of surveys and Committee progress reports may be found in the *Annual Report – 1970,* a bulletin of the AAA, or in the AAA *Newsletter.*

American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Direct inquiries to: Margaret Rumbarger, AAUP, One DuPont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Committee W, originally created in 1919, was reactivated in 1970. Composed of eight members and chaired by Alice Rossi, it held its first meeting in September. Its two major goals are to educate the profession regarding the special problems faced by women in academe, and make specific recommendations in policy areas. In this latter endeavor, a number of concerns have become prominent – nepotism regulations, maternity leaves and part-time appointments. Policy statements on nepotism and maternity leaves may be made in conjunction with Committee A and Committee C of the Association. The Committee plans to publish an article in the *AAUP Bulletin* on the major findings of recent research. Further, the Committee is encouraging concern about the status of women in the profession through local AAUP Chapters and state conferences.

American College Personnel Association (ACPA). Direct inquiries to: Dr. Elizabeth Greenleaf, 914 Meadowbrook, Bloomington, Indiana 47401.

A Task Force for Concerns of Women in the Student Personnel Profession was recently appointed in this division of the American Personnel and Guidance Association. The group has five members headed by Dr. Elizabeth Greenleaf. Although their concerns will be wide ranging, their primary current goal is to coordinate their activities with those of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators and the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors.

American Historical Association (AHA). Direct inquiries to: Dr. Willie Lee Rose, American Historical Association, 400 A Street S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003, Attention: Miss Eileen Gaylard.

In response to a petition, the executive council of the Association established the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women in the Historical Profession. This five member group is chaired by Willie Lee Rose. Its directives include: to commission studies and collect statistics and other information on the standing of women in the profession, to arrange sessions and hearings during the convention, to make public any findings, to publish and circulate results of committee and other studies, to obtain information relating to specific instances of discrimination, and to make recommendations for action to the Association. Most Committee activity has been focused on: (1) supervising a survey of employment patterns in 30 representative institutions; (2) designing a questionnaire to be submitted to all 1970 PhD recipients to discover what kinds of employment men and women are offered, why they have taken the jobs they hold, how many men and women have found suitable employment, and why some have not; (3) surveying the participation of women in the programs and committees of the AHA; (4) preparing two sessions for the 1970 AHA meeting; and (5) drafting recommended resolutions to be considered by the AHA.

American Library Association (ALA). Direct inquiries to: Miss Kay Ann Cassell, 1060 Stuyvesant Ave. #A7, Trenton, New Jersey 08618.

Kay Cassell and Linda Robson head the Task Force on the Status of Women in Librarianship. The group, created in July 1970, is loosely structured with one or two people functioning as coordinators in about six regional areas. The emphasis is on voluntarism so that various activities considered relevant to the Task Force's concerns are carried out by those who wish. Thus, one of the primary functions of the Task Force is to coordinate these activities. So far, several bibliographies have been initiated – literature on women in libraries, day care centers, abortion, and the history of women. Lists of material are being developed for use in all libraries, and they will be encouraged to acquire more materials on these topics. Another goal of the Task Force is to raise the awareness of women within the profession regarding their status.

The Association has the mechanism needed to handle individual cases of discrimination, and the Task Force plans to encourage its use. A resolution on the status of women in the profession is on the association's conference agenda. Since it was not considered at the last meeting, some revision may be made before it arises again.

American Orthopsychiatric Association. Direct inquiries to: American Orthopsychiatric Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, New York 10019.

As a result of member activities, part of the program for the annual convention on March 21-24 dealt with the status of women within the Association.

American Political Science Association (APSA). Direct inquiries to: Dr. Josephine E. Milburn, Department of Political Science, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, Rhode Island 02881.

A Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession was appointed in March 1969. This 11 member group chaired by Josephine Milburn has been very active ever since. Its directive includes a mandate to: elicit information about the problems faced by women entering the profession; suggest a program for encouraging women to become political scientists; and suggest ways of improving the professional status of women. A progress report on the Committee's work includes the following list of the Committee's activities: a survey of political science departments; construction of a bibliography on women; a survey of problems that women may face in the profession; interviews and meetings with other interested associations, parties and people; implementation of the adopted Association resolutions; and consideration of further proposals to be recommended to the Association. Most of these activities are continuing. An analysis of the information returned by department chairmen was published (Schuck, Victoria, "Women in Political Science, Some Preliminary Observations," *Political Science 2,* Fall 1969, pp. 642-53).

American Society for Microbiology (ASM). Direct inquiries to: Dr. O. Langlykke, American Society for Microbiology, 1913 I St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

A resolution to establish the Committee on the Status of Women in Microbiology was adopted at the annual ASM meeting in April 1970. Dr. Mary Louise Robbins chairs the six-member group that conducted a survey of women in the profession during the past year. A preliminary report of their findings is being published in the April 1971 issue of the *ASM News.* Further goals for the Committee are now being considered.

American Sociological Association (ASA). Direct inquiries to: Dr. Elise Boulding, Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80302.

In November 1970, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology was created. Elise Boulding chairs the six-member group and expresses the hope that the Committee will not focus entirely on fact finding but will perform planning and implementation functions. The Committee intends to work for (1) abolishment of departmental or institutional discrimination against female graduate students with respect to financial aid and admissions; (2) abolishment of institutional or departmental discrimination against women with respect to hiring, paying and promoting; (3) ensuring that part-time staff receive proportional pay and accrue benefits awarded full-time employees; (4) institution of a more flexible leave policy for males and females; and (5) abolishment of antinepotism regulations.

American Speech and Hearing Association (ASHA). Direct inquiries to: Mrs. Dorothy K. Marge, 8011 Langbrook Road, Springfield, Virginia 22152.

Acting on recommendations for a committee on women, the ASHA referred the matter to a Committee on Political and Social Responsibility within the profession which, in turn, recommended creation of a Subcommittee on the Status of Women. The Subcommittee, headed by Mrs. Marge, has five members. At the end of 1 year in existence, it is expected that a proposal for full committee status will be made. The women's caucus within the Association plans to provide guidelines for the Subcommittee's activities. So far, a fact sheet on the standing of women within the Association has been prepared, and a study on women in the Association has been initiated.

Association for Women in Psychology (AWP). Direct inquiries to: Robert Brannon, 3088 Williamsburg St., Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104.

This group held its national organizing conference in February 1970. The organization is concerned with sexual roles in society from educational, professional and research viewpoints and wishes to explore the contributions which psychology can, does, and should make to the definition, investigation, and modifications of role stereotypes. Established initially with a hierarchical structure, new by-laws were ratified in the fall of 1970 by the members that decentralize power and decisionmaking and broaden the basis for organizational support. The organization, headed by Jo-Ann Gardner, has recently implemented the new organizational structure. Although the organization's initial concerns centered on women psychologis s, it intends to be relevant for all women whose lives are influenced by the science and profession of psychology. A number of projects filled the interim between origination and the first annual membership meeting in September. These included compilation of a bibliography of research on women, compilation of information on women's courses, planning for participation at the American Psychological Association (APA) convention, and planning for other activities related to the status of women. Presently, a committee under the direction of Dr. Annette Brodsky (1600 West Freeman, Carbondale, Illinois 62901) is compiling a directory of self-declared feminists in clinical practice or any therapeutic setting.

The group has directed most attention to the APA as the prime professional group in psychology and because of a great deal of overlapping membership. At the 1970 annual APA convention, AWP held programs on women and presented 50 resolutions that were considered by the APA Council in October. So far, the APA has taken two actions directly related to women in the profession – it set up child care facilities for the next convention and established a task force to write a position paper on the status of women in psychology.

Colorado Commission on the Status of Women. Direct inquiries to: Mr. Michael Churchman, Kent School for Girls, 4004 East Quincy Avenue, Inglewood, Colorado 80110.

Mrs. Arthur T. Copperthwaite is the second person to chair this Commission since its inception in December 1964. The Commission was created by the governor of Colorado, and its membership has varied in number from 32 to 75. A committee structure serves to carry out the specific projects or goals of the Commission. Although the Commission has many concerns, one of prime importance, which evolved from its first report, is discrimination in higher education. Recently, the Education Committee, chaired by Mr. Churchman, distributed a questionnaire to all institutions of higher education in the state to ascertain the extent of sexual discrimination over a 5-year period. A completed report is expected to be made public in the summer of 1971.

Colorado State University. Direct inquiries to: Leslie Hammond, c/o Office of Women's Relations, Student Services Building, Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, Colorado 80521.

Women students on campus initiated the creation of a Commission on the Status of Women in fall 1970. Leslie Hammond chairs the group which has 16 members – five students, five faculty, five administrators and one community representative. The Commission's several goals

broadly include research, education and coordination. It plans to conduct research on women students and faculty, and to direct educational efforts toward increasing awareness of women's problems on and off campus. To this end, several discussion groups have already been organized and attempts are being made to maximize the use of talent through fostering continuing education for women and utilizing educated women in the community. The Commission is trying to coordinate the various campus agencies' activities that affect women – e.g., those aimed at career development.

Harvard University. Direct inquiries to: Caroline W. Bynum, Committee on the Status of Women, 471 Broadway, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138.

The Committee on the Status of Women was appointed by the dean in June 1970. It is composed of six faculty members and co-chaired by Caroline Bynum and Michael Walzer. Working closely with them is a five person consulting committee composed of female graduate students; two were elected and three appointed by the Committee. Most of the work has taken place since fall of 1970, and the Committee hopes to have a completed report ready in March 1971, which will include legislative proposals for presentation to the faculty. So far, activities have centered primarily on information gathering based on statistics about Harvard, personal testimony and other schools' reports. Several open hearings have been held on various topics including: problems of "regular and non-ladder" faculty women; problems related to university women such as day care centers, maternity leave, health services and part-time employment; and problems of the graduate student, such as job placement.

Department chairmen have been asked to respond to questionnaires concerning hiring policies and graduate student women. Questionnaires are also being prepared for all women graduate students and selected men, and for persons who were admitted in 1950, 1957 and 1964. The Committee is planning to interview all women faculty as well as other significant University personnel such as deans.

Intercollegiate Association of Women Students. Direct inquiries to: Louise Douce, National President, Intercollegiate Association of Women Students, P.O. Box 3028, University Station, Columbus, Ohio 43210; Karen Keesling, Executive Director, 500 West 11th, Lawrence, Kansas 66044; Emily Taylor, National Advisor, Dean of Women, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66044.

The national organization is encouraging local campus chapters to focus all or part of their energy on the status of women. Much of the impetus for action in this direction came from resolutions passed at the 1969 annual convention. Studies of women including faculty members are encouraged. The information gathered will be coordinated by a clearinghouse at Ohio State University. The chapters are also concerned with rules, regulations and procedures on campus that discriminate against women, and hope to provide both a counseling and educational service for women students.

University of Kansas. Direct inquiries to: Marilyn Stokstad, Art Museum, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66044.

In the spring of 1970, the local AAUP chapter set up a Commission on the Status of Women. This six-member group is headed by Marilyn Stokstad who was instrumental in creating a similar body at the state level. The Committee is currently engaged in a study of the economic status of women, but hopes to consider other topics in the future.

University of Minnesota. Direct inquiries to: Director of Research, Minnesota Planning and Counseling Center for Women, 301 Walter Library, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455.

The Minnesota Planning and Counseling Center for Women is sampling 826 4-year colleges and universities with enrollments over 1,000. Information was requested on proposed or completed studies on the status of women, and courses or seminars offered expressly for or about women. Responses have included information on the status of faculty women. The report is due to be released by the first of 1971.

Modern Languages Association (MLA). Direct inquiries to: Dr. Florence Howe, Goucher College, Towson, Maryland 21204.

Florence Howe heads the eight-member Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession which was created by the executive council in the spring of 1969. The Commission has been engaged in a number of activities. It publishes a newsletter which is distributed to several hundred people. It has completed a study and essay on antinepotism rules that will be submitted for publication, and is available now from the Commission. It surveyed people who are teaching or planning to teach courses in women studies, collecting syllabi, course descriptions and bibliographies. The completed report, *Female Studies II*, covers materials relating to 66 new courses. It conducted a survey of 1,000 departments in the profession and reported on this and Commission activities at the MLA annual convention. A few of its findings may be found in the business meeting address of the chairman which appeared in the February 1971 *MLA Newsletter.* A full Commission report will be published in the May 1971 *PMLA*. Activities of the Commission during the convention will be published in the May 1971 *College English.* Most recently, the Commission has formulated five guidelines for the entire profession which is being distributed to department chairman of PhD granting institutions. Each department is expected to describe in detail their own plans for affirmative actions.

University of Pittsburgh. Direct inquiries to: Mary Lou Burger, University Times, University of Pittsburgh, Room 503, 200 S. Craig St., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213.

Mary Lou Burger chairs the Advisory Council on Women's Opportunities, which has grown to 30 members since its inception in May 1970. The Chancellor of the University of Fittsburgh created the group to serve as a source of collective advice, consultation and assistance to the vice-chancellors' studies on women. Besides its liaison functions with the vice-chancellors, the Council has produced several reports: a preliminary report on the Medical School, a report on the Faculty Handbook, a report on the Employee Handbook, and a report on the Affirmative Action Program. Further, it helped to develop questionnaires for the Provost's Office, and has created its own questionnaire and tests intended to gather and organize most effectively the data necessary for determining the situation of women at the University of Pittsburgh. The Council's November progress report contains specific recommendations concerning the Council and its needs and general recommendations on actions to be implemented by the University ("Advisory Council on Women's Opportunities. Progress Report to the Chancellor." November 2, 1970, 14 pages. ED 045 054. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29).

Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues. Direct inquiries to: Jane W. Torrey, Box 1542, Connecticut College, New London, Connecticut 06320.

Plans were formulated for the Committee on Sex Discrimination at the fall 1970 annual meeting. Since then it has been formally approved and funded. Jane Torrey chairs this group of about six active members. Currently, their goal is to collect statistics on women within the profession comparable to those compiled by the American Sociological Association. A questionnaire seeking to determine the number of women at various levels has been sent to all chairmen of psychology departments that have doctoral programs.

University of Wisconsin, Madison. Direct inquiries to: Jeanne Stott, 1564 Van Hise, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706.

In January 1969, the faculty council requested a formal study of the status of women faculty members on the Madison campus. The administration has begun work in this area. The first area of study to be completed will be on sex differential in rank and pay. Other aspects will be researched in the future.

Women's Equity Action League (WEAL). Direct inquiries to: WEAL, Women's City Club, Bulkey Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44115; Dr. Heather Sigworth, College of Law, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, Illinois 61820; Dr. Bernice Sandler, 10700 Lockridge Dr., Silver Spring, Maryland 20901.

Two committees in this organization are directly relevant to women in higher education. The Action Subcommittee against Nepotism Regulations was created in the fall of 1970. Heather Sigworth heads this committee which was set up to deal with complaints, actions and inquiries about nepotism regulations. Activities have so far centered on nepotism regulations in higher education.

The Action Committee for Federal Contract Compliance in Education headed by Bernice Sandler began functioning in the fall of 1969. The Committee collects and disseminates information and handles complaints related to compliance with federal contracts. Most of the complaints handled have concerned higher education institutions.

Yale University. Direct inquiries to: Elga Wasserman, Special Assistant to the President on the Education of Women, 1949 Yale Station-110 Strathcona, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut 06520.

President Kingman Brewster of Yale University appointed an eight-member committee chaired by Dr. Thomas M. Greene. Entitled the Committee on the Status of Academic Women, the Committee is to review the present participation of women in teaching and administration at Yale, explore ways of increasing participation under existing policies, and suggest revisions in existing policies and procedures in order to increase such participation.

REFERENCES

Achbar, Francine and Bishop, Pam. "Harvard Probed for Discrimination Against Women," *Boston Herald Traveler* 31, April 5, 1970.

Alexander, Anne. "Who's Come a Long Way, Baby?" *The Johns Hopkins Magazine* 21, April 1970, pp. 10-15.

Astin, Helen S. "Factors Associated with the Participation of Women Doctorates in the Labor Force," *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 43, November 1967, pp. 240-46.

———. *The Woman Doctorate in America.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

Batten, James K. "Bias Issue Embroils Harvard and HEW," *Washington Evening Star* 115, April 25, 1970.

Bayer, Alan E. "College and University Faculty: A Statistical Description," *ACE Research Reports* 5, June 1970. Washington: American Council on Education, 1970, 46 pp. ED 042 425. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

Bayer, Alan E. and Astin, Helen S. "Sex Differences in Academic Rank and Salary among Science Doctorates in Teaching," *Journal of Human Resources* 3, Spring 1968, pp. 191-200.

Bazell, Robert J. "Sex Discrimination: Campuses Face Contract Loss Over HEW Demands," *Science* 170, November 20, 1970, pp. 834-35.

Bernard, Jessie. *Academic Women.* University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964.

Bunting, Mary, Graham, Patricia A. and Wasserman, Elga R. "Academic Freedom and Incentive for Women," *Educational Record* 51, Fall 1970, pp. 386-91.

Bynum, Caroline W. and Martin, Janet M. "The Sad Status of Women Teaching at Harvard or 'From what you said I would never have known you were a woman,'" *Radcliffe Quarterly* 54, June 1970, pp. 12-14.

Collins, J. "Women in the Universities," *The Radical Teacher,* December 30, 1969, pp. 13-14. An occasional publication. Copies may be obtained from The New University Conference, 622 West Diversey Parkway, Chicago, Illinois 60614, $1.00.

Davis, Ann E. "Women as a Minority Group in Higher Academics," *The American Sociologist* 4, May 1969, pp. 95-98.

Fidell, Linda S. "Empirical Verification of Sex Discrimination in Hiring Practices in Psychology," *American Psychologist* 25, December 1970, pp. 1094-98.

Fischer, Ann and Golde, Peggy. "The Position of Women in Anthropology," *American Anthropologist* 70, April 1968, pp. 337-44.

Francis, Barbara. "The Status of Women at Cornell." [1970], 6 pp. ED 044 095. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

Freeman, Jo. "Women on the Social Science Faculties since 1892." 1969, 14 pp. ED 041 567. MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

Gardner, Helen Rogers. *Women Administrators in Higher Education in Illinois: A Study of Current Career Patterns.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1966.

Graham, Patricia A. "Women in Academe," *Science* 169, September 25, 1970, pp. 1284-90.

Grouchow, Nancy. "Discrimination: Women Charge Universities, Colleges with Bias," *Science* 168, May 1, 1970, pp. 559-61.

Harris, Ann S. "The Second Sex in Academe," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin* 56, September 1970, pp. 283-95.

Hawkins, Ruth R. "The Odds Against Women," *Change in Higher Education* 1, November-December 1969, pp. 34-36.

Henderson, Jean C.G. "Women as College Teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1967.

"Highest Percentage of Women Teachers at Two-year Colleges," *Higher Education and National Affairs* 19, July 17, 1970, p. 5.

Hooper, Mary E. and Chandler, Marjorie O. *Earned Degrees Conferred: 1967-68 Part A – Summary Data.* Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics, May 1969.

Katz, Joseph, Comstock, Peggy and Lozoff, Marjorie M. *Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Adult Women.* Report to the College Entrance Examination Board. Stanford, California: Institute for the Study of Human Problems, Stanford University, 1970, 265 pp. ED 045 005. MF-$0.65, HC-$9.87.

Kaufmann, Susan B. "Few Women get Positions of Power in Academe, Survey Discloses," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 5, November 30, 1970, pp. 1, 4.

Keiffer, Miriam J. and Cullen, Dallas M. Discrimination Experienced by Academic Female Psychologists. Pittsburgh: KNOW, Inc., 1970 (726 Saint James Street, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15232, $0.25).

Logan, Jr., Albert A. "Universities Told They must Grant Equal Opportunity to Women," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 4, July 6, 1970, p. 5.

McGuigan, Dorothy G. *A Dangerous Experiment.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: Center for Continuing Education of Women, 1970.

Mitchell, Susan B. *Women and the Doctorate: A Study of the Enabling or Impeding Factors Operative among Oklahoma's Women Doctoral Recipients in the Attainment and Use of the Degree.* Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research, October 1968, 154 pp. ED 024 352. MF-$0.65, HC-$6.58.

Oltman, Ruth M. "Campus 1970 – Where do Women Stand?" *American Association of University Women Journal* 64, November 1970a, pp. 14-15.

———. *Campus 1970, Where do Women Stand? Research Report of a Survey on Women in Academe.* Washington: American Association of University Women, December 1970b, 47 pp. HE 001 915 (RIE May 71) MF-$0.65, HC-$3.29.

"Rebelling Women – the Reason," *The U.S. News and World Report* 69, April 13, 1970, pp. 35-37.

Rossi, Alice S. "Discrimination and Demography Restrict Opportunities for Academic Women," *College and University Business* 48, February 1970a, pp. 74-78.

———. "Status of Women in Graduate Departments of Sociology: 1968-1969," *The American Sociologist* 5, February 1970b, pp. 1-12.

Schuck, Victoria. "Reports of the APSA Committees: Part II of the Committee Report, Some Comparative Statistics on Women in Political Science and Other Social Sciences," *Political Scientist* 3, Summer 1970, pp. 357-59.

———. "Women in Political Science: Some Preliminary Observations," *Political Scientist* 2, Fall 1969, pp. 642-53.

Scully, Malcolm G. "Women in Higher Education: Challenging the Status Quo," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 4, February 9, 1970, pp. 2-5.

Shaffer, Harry G. and Shaffer, Juliet P. "Job Discrimination against Faculty Wives," *The Journal of Higher Education* 37, January 1966, pp. 10-15.

Shortridge, Kathleen. *Women as University Nigger: How the 'U' Keeps Females in Their Place.* Pittsburgh: KNOW, Inc., 1970 (726 Saint James Street, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15232, $0.15).

Siegel, Alberta E. and Carr, Ronald G. "Education of Women at Stanford University." In *The Study of Education at Stanford: A Report to the University. Graduate Education.* Stanford, California: Stanford University, March 1969, pp. 81-100. ED 032

849. MF-$0.65, HC-Not available from EDRS. Copies of this report are available from the Study of Education at Stanford, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305.

Simon, Rita J., Clark, Shirley M. and Galway, K. "The Woman Ph.D.: A Recent Profile," *Social Problems* 15, Fall 1967, pp. 221-36.

Simon, Rita J., Clark, Shirley M. and Tifft, L.L. "Of Nepotism, Marriage, and the Pursuit of an Academic Career," *Sociology of Education* 39, Fall 1966, pp. 344-58.

Simon, Rita J. and Rosenthal, Evelyn. "Profile of the Woman Ph.D. in Economics, History, and Sociology," *American Association of University Women Journal* 60, March 1967, pp. 127-29.

Simpson, Lawrence A. "Attitudes of Higher Education Employing Agents toward Academic Women," *Graduate Comment* 12, December 1969, pp. 41-46.

———. "A Myth is Better than a Miss," *College and University* Business 48, February 1970, pp. 72-73.

———. "A Study of Employing Agents' Attitudes toward Academic Women in Higher Education." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1968.

Wentworth, Eric. "Women Seek Equality in Universities," *The Washington Post* 93, June 22, 1970.

Wilcox, Thomas. "The Lot of the Woman: A Report on the National Survey of Undergraduate English Programs," *Bulletin of the Association of Departments of English* 25, May 1970, pp. 53-59. ED 045 011. Not available from EDRS.

Winkler, Mary C. "The Life Styles of Women with Earned Indiana University Doctorates." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Indiana, 1968.